

University of South Dakota

USD RED

Honors Thesis

Theses, Dissertations, and Student Projects

Spring 5-4-2024

Recidivism in South Dakota

Allison L. Young

University of South Dakota

Follow this and additional works at: <https://red.library.usd.edu/honors-thesis>



Part of the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#), [Quantitative, Qualitative, Comparative, and Historical Methodologies Commons](#), [Regional Sociology Commons](#), [Social Control, Law, Crime, and Deviance Commons](#), and the [Social Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Young, Allison L., "Recidivism in South Dakota" (2024). *Honors Thesis*. 323.

<https://red.library.usd.edu/honors-thesis/323>

This Honors Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, and Student Projects at USD RED. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Thesis by an authorized administrator of USD RED. For more information, please contact dloftus@usd.edu.

Recidivism in South Dakota

by

Allison Young

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the

University Honors Program

Department of Psychology

The University of South Dakota

April 2024

ABSTRACT

The South Dakota Criminal Justice System suffers from a high recidivism rate across the state. There are few resocialization methods used within state facilities, and the existing ones have not adequately addressed what is causing the high rate. People who are either incarcerated or were formerly incarcerated have a myriad of systematic barriers that prevent them from finding a stable footing before and after release. This literature analysis aims to compare existing resocialization methods among various countries and states to South Dakota's techniques to identify which would be most successful for the state. Using a grounded-theory structure for the analysis assisted in collecting data gathered from other articles discussing recidivism, which later helped to determine the best approach for reducing the high rate. This literature review should aid policymakers in understanding what decisions work most efficiently to help keep people from returning to prison.

Keywords: South Dakota, recidivism, incarcerated, resocialization

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgementsv

Introduction.....1

Literature Review1

 Definitions of Recidivism 1

Contributors to Recidivism.....2

 Employment..... 2

 Housing & Housing Alternatives..... 4

 Education Opportunities 5

 Disenfranchisement of Rights..... 8

Approaches to Recidivism Across the World.....10

 Japan 10

 Philippines 13

 Finland 15

 Norway..... 17

Approaches to Recidivism in the United States19

 South Dakota.....21

 Other States.....24

 Alaska 24

 Delaware 27

Texas.....	29
Oregon	30
Discussion and Conclusion	32
Policy Recommendations.....	32
References	36

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Undergoing the research for this thesis has taught me all sorts of lessons that I will remember for the rest of my academic career. One of the most important takeaways from this was how essential it is to effectively communicate with others. I learned that creating original research takes help from numerous people, and I could not have done this without them.

First, I would like to thank my director, Dr. Cohen, for everything he has done for me. He continuously motivated me to progress through the difficulties I had to face, and he did so without a second thought. Dr. Cohen's passion for helping others has inspired me to follow in his footsteps by pursuing a career where I can also directly help others who are struggling. His time and effort will forever be appreciated, and I could not have done it without him.

I would also like to thank my other committee members, Dr. Struckman-Johnson and Dr. Thimsen, both of whom have helped significantly by allowing me to research this topic. Their guidance encouraged me to put my best foot forward and produce quality research that will help those who struggle with recidivism.

Finally, my family and close friends were major influences in encouraging me to do my best work. They have been my support system throughout this, and I am extremely thankful to have them in my life. Their advice to me was monumental and unforgettable. I love you all.

INTRODUCTION

In South Dakota, 40.3 percent of formerly incarcerated individuals return to prison due to technical parole violations or new convictions (SDDOC, 2023). Many criminologists argue that incarcerated individuals with impending release dates should be provided with appropriate resocialization before societal reintegration—lest existing discrimination issues further intensify. It is particularly important, as those who are not re-socialized are increasingly more likely to recidivate (Maltseva et al., 2021). Many ex-offenders feel a strong sense of disconnect with society following their period of incarceration, leading them to resort back to what they do know: criminal deviancy (Stam et al., 2023). Our existing resocialization and reintegration programs in the United States are often argued to be inadequate—the evidence for which can be seen through the sheer number of recidivating individuals (SDDOC, 2023). With a lack of proper resocialization, it can lessen available opportunities following release and in turn lead to the return of the formerly incarcerated to prison (Flores, 2018).

Reintegrative methods vary from country to country, and most places use specific socialization techniques in a way that follows the values and beliefs of their culture. The United States does not have one set way to do so, and this creates gaps within the research that prevent reform from happening. One way to ameliorate this issue is for incarcerated individuals to be afforded more opportunities to rebuild themselves before their societal reintegration based on their specific needs. This study's purpose is to address recidivism rate increases in South Dakota by analyzing existing state resocialization methods and their effectiveness.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Definitions of Recidivism

Eaglin (2017) explains that recidivism can be defined as “the recurrence of criminal behavior by an individual.” If someone violates their parole—or commits another criminal offense—the consequences are often severe and result in the individual being re-incarcerated. To that end, many prisons and jails utilize recidivism risk measurements to identify if there is a potential for the individual to return to prison (Desmarais et al., 2017). Risk measurements can be grouped into two different categories: 1) the individual’s illegal actions and 2) the individual’s interactions with the criminal justice institution (Ijun et al., 2022). Understanding risk measurement is complicated somewhat by the fact that every country measures recidivism in its way by utilizing aspects specific to its region. When comparing national recidivism rates, it is important to understand how exactly each country does its measurements and what specific strengths and limitations come along with it (King & Elderbroom, 2014). The different components that make up a recidivism risk measurement instrument include the time incarcerated, population size, individual characteristics, and what criteria are met based on data collected from inmates (Klinge, 2019).

Contributors to Recidivism

Employment

Employment is one of the most urgent needs that incarcerated individuals must address upon their release from prison. Although some businesses do not require potential hires to state whether they have a felony, most industry standards necessitate background checks on new hires—leading most of the formerly incarcerated to run into employment discrimination (Erstad, 2018). This makes it extremely difficult for ex-convicts to obtain a stable paying job after their incarceration. Since they do not have a legal way to earn money, many formerly incarcerated individuals may be forced to resort to obtaining money illegally just to survive (Siwach, 2018).

For the few who are employed shortly after being released, working at a job promotes socialization, financial responsibility, and independence (Bledowski et al., 2023). Being employed keeps a person busy and preoccupied, which helps them to stay focused rather than resorting to illegal activities to earn money. Despite these benefits, obstacles remain in the workplace, which may lead an individual to recidivate. Low wages lower morale and the motivation to stay on track. Employment discrimination, such as being asked about a criminal record, is especially prevalent. This leads to biases and stigmas being foisted onto the individual even upon the first interview (Bledowski et al., 2023). Having to apply for employment while facing prejudice and discrimination makes it challenging to obtain a job in the first place.

According to Harwin, most employers in the United States refuse to hire ex-convicts who have a criminal record—no matter what the charges are (Harwin, 2012). People who were formerly incarcerated already have the disadvantage of a criminal record and, on top of that, they face problems associated with their characteristics and demographics. Weiman (2007) delineated many socioeconomic disadvantages that affect people post-incarceration such as lack of education. If ex-convicts do not receive proper education, such as a high school diploma, finding a well-paying job becomes much more difficult. A lack of work experience due to the amount of time spent incarcerated and geographic location can also add to this struggle.

Weiman (2007) also found other issues that stem from employer preferences in their examination of the Los Angeles labor market. Employers were either completely against hiring someone with a criminal record or they were only accepting of those who committed nonviolent crimes. Some may only hire ex-convicts if they have already been released for more than a few years (Weiman, 2007). This makes it especially hard for people fresh out of prison.

The use of criminal background checks shows what crime was committed, but they do not show the circumstances and situation that the person was in at the time. Being in impoverished neighborhoods puts the people there in a situation where they sometimes need to find alternative ways to make money. Most methods are not going to be legal, which leads to the arrests of many from these locations. Each person who has been incarcerated has their own story and defense, so an employer is not going to see both sides of the story just based on a criminal record. The internet today can stain someone for the rest of their life, even years after a crime was committed. Even with the use of expungement, someone's record may never be completely erased from the internet (Westrope, 2018).

Housing & Housing Alternatives

Housing for the formerly incarcerated is another core factor in understanding recidivism rates (Wong et al., 2019). This can also be one of the hardest elements to address—due to many of the factors that have already been delineated. Social factors, including family or friends, that can assist with this depend entirely on their existing relationship statuses. If the individual is not in good standing with their family, they may not be offered housing or support. Western et al. (2015) has noted that family reunification services can help to ameliorate this issue.

There are also housing alternatives that offer support to those in need, but they are the exception rather than the rule. One example is halfway houses, which are substance-free environments. They consist of other people recovering from addiction and mental health issues, as well as those who are out on parole or have early release (Hodgman-Korth, 2023). Halfway houses help to keep individuals accountable and responsible while providing a space for them to reintegrate back into the community. On the other hand, halfway houses can also limit an

individual's ability to reintegrate back into the community due to the stigma associated with halfway houses (Keene et al., 2018). Neighborhoods may be against a halfway house, government funding can be cut or reduced, and constant criticism from the public can compound upon existing stressors, adding stress to the residents and possibly leading them to recidivate (Wong et al. 2019). The consequence of this is that a lack of housing options leaves many at risk of falling into a state of homelessness.

Coulette (2018) argues that ex-convicts are almost ten times as likely to be homeless compared to the public, making it much more difficult to obtain housing. Keene et al. (2018) noted how both individuals and state policies contribute to these stigmas. Individuals, being potential employers and landlords, can deny the formerly incarcerated from obtaining a job for rent money, and they can deny the individual from being able to lease housing (Keene et al., 2018). State policies bar people from opportunities for rehabilitation and financial success by requiring criminal background checks. The intersection of these public and private policies results in the creation of a structural stigma—resulting from these societal, cultural, and institutional conditions that are placed upon the individuals—that inhibits their opportunities and ultimately has a deleterious impact on their overall well-being (Hatzenbueler et al., 2013). Keene et al. (2018) argue that the resulting benefits of obtaining housing post-incarceration significantly reduce the chances of recidivism by providing a means to obtain employment, avoid criminal activities and people associated with them, and prevent parolees from violating parole. Parents, in particular, benefit from this since they can provide a safe and stable environment for their children that allows them to parent to the best of their ability.

Education Opportunities

Education is equally important when considering ex-convicts transitioning back into society. States with prisons that implement quality education programs have noted decreases in recidivism (Hall, 2015). Davis et al. (2013) noted that education before release allows for more employment opportunities by providing the qualifications needed to obtain said job. Doing so creates a stable environment for the formerly incarcerated and has been found to decrease stress associated with not having access to these opportunities (Hall, 2015).

Formal education, or “structured learning”, within the prison system can be broken up into two different types of academic and vocational training (Magee, 2021). Academic learning consists of the high school and post-secondary education levels. If one does not obtain a high school diploma, they can resort to general education development (GED) programs or adult basic education (ABE) programs (Davis et al., 2013). Vocational training is akin to academic education programs, but they focus more specifically on certain skills and occupations (Magee, 2021). This type of “work-related learning” centers on the fact that a four-year degree is not required, making vocational training much more attainable for ex-offenders.

Although not every prison in America can support and afford academic and/or vocational training programs, the ones that can have shown all manner of benefits that result from participation during incarceration and after release (Pelletier & Evans, 2019). These benefits include the development of social networks, personal skills, employment opportunities, and improved relationships with family members and peers (Petre & Tomiță, 2022). Prison populations vary widely in the distribution of education levels. Some may have not completed high school, others may have little to no college experience, and some have college degrees (Magee, 2021). In general, advancing your academic learning and education is beneficial to

obtaining employment after incarceration, and recidivism rates see correspondingly significant declines as a result (Davis et al., 2013).

Davis et al. (2013) examined the connection between education and recidivism and concluded that educational programs available during incarceration can reduce recidivism by up to 43 percent. They found that even just completing ABE or GED programs reduces recidivism by 30 percent (Davis et al. 2013). That being said, these numbers are not entirely definitive due to variations in program types and quality of teaching. In Petre & Tomiță's (2022) examination of the effectiveness of detention officers with different educational programs, they identified the ways that officers contribute to positive interactions and learning. When prisoners have positive role models surrounding them, this influences their behavior and overall attitude (Petre & Tomiță, 2022). Petre & Tomiță (2022) argue that relationships and interactions between prisoners and officers are extremely important in developing a safe and secure environment, especially for learning. They can do this by practicing good relationship building, using authority effectively, encouraging reinforcements, and discouraging misconduct (Petre & Tomiță, 2022). To ensure that prisoners obtain a quality education, officers and staff must acknowledge and create an efficient learning environment (Petre & Tomiță, 2022). Once the environment allows for successful learning, educational and personal skills can develop.

Pelletier and Evans (2019) interviewed formerly incarcerated individuals to highlight and determine what skills came from the education they obtained while incarcerated. They found that communication, confidence, social connections, and leadership skills make up most benefits when participating in higher education programs (Pelletier & Evans, 2019). At the specific institute where the study was conducted, the teachers and professors made sure to treat the prisoners like "human beings" rather than prisoners, thus furthering positive communication and

social interactions (Pelletier & Evans, 2019). Pelletier and Evans (2019) found that the types of classes offered were linked to unique and divergent skill development opportunities. Classes such as financial management, public speaking, and writing are universal and can be applied to almost any job. Most of all, they provide prisoners with newfound confidence in their abilities.

Disenfranchisement of Rights

Rights and freedoms give a sense of importance and belonging; without them, they diminish an individual's sense of self-worth and community involvement. Disenfranchisement, or losing the right to vote, is among the many reasons that ex-convicts continue to recidivate (Miller & Agnich, 2015). Along with voting rights, access to firearms is prohibited, jury duty is revoked, and some incarcerates can be put on parole for an extended period (Forrest, 2016). State laws vary depending on the types and how many rights can be taken away (Heath, 2017). Some are strict, others are more lenient. In the United States, almost 5.85 million adults must face disenfranchisement due to felony convictions (Uggen et al., 2012). By having their rights taken away, ex-convicts' motivation to reintegrate back into society decreases and thus increases the likelihood of recidivism.

When considering the effects of disenfranchisement, many underscore elements of its merits. Aviram et al. (2017) noted that the right to vote is a privilege, and when someone does not follow the law, the government has a responsibility to make sure that they cannot contribute to making laws. Such arguments are grounded in concepts of punishment as opposed to rehabilitation. Although ex-cons have already served their time in the prison system, some believe that punishment afterward will help to stop them from recidivating—though others have found that this is not the case (Miller & Agnich, 2016). Miller and Agnich (2016) discuss how disenfranchisement creates “shame” towards these affected individuals, and thus impacts their

community involvement and acceptance. As such, disenfranchisement leads to alienation in the community, stigmas and biases, and psychological harm.

According to the National Conference of State Legislatures (2023), eleven states in the U.S. can revoke the right to vote permanently even after release for certain crimes. In these cases, only a gubernatorial pardon can be utilized to reinstate the individual's voting rights. Moreover, there is also a subsequent waiting period following release that requires further actions ("Brief Voting," 2023). With all those restrictions put on ex-convicts, just the effort alone to regain voting rights can be nearly impossible for some. It decreases their motivation to want to reintegrate back into society since they cannot participate in their civic duties as an American citizen. Not only does this decrease motivation, but it also deters formerly incarcerated individuals from wanting to participate civically in the future (Miller & Agnich, 2016). Without a good sense of community, they start to feel isolated from those around them, and it creates a disconnect between the individual and society.

U.S. culture is predominantly aimed at shaming criminals through stigmatization as opposed to utilizing other techniques like reintegrative shaming. Braithwaite's (1989) theory of reintegrative shaming suggests that societies are more likely to have less crime if they practice effective shaming of the people who commit them. Reintegrative shaming maintains the idea that the person who committed the crime is still good and only the action of the crime was bad. In contrast, stigmatization treats the offender as a bad person based on the crime alone (Braithwaite, 1989). Societal stigma towards ex-convicts leads to the internalization of the associated stereotypes and behaviors, which causes the person to identify with the stigma (Moore et al., 2016). This starts a cycle of maladaptive coping mechanisms that eventually lead to criminal activity where most individuals are rearrested (Moore et al., 2016).

More needs to be done in the U.S. to combat ex-convict stigma. People are incarcerated and face the consequences of their actions by doing their time, but (when they are released) it follows them in the form of societal barriers and stereotypes put upon them by their communities. They suffer disenfranchisement while incarcerated and yet the punishment still follows them even after being released. This is extremely harmful to the self-image of the formerly incarcerated, with disenfranchisement only contributing to the “revolving door” of the prison system (Riley, 2017).

Approaches to Recidivism Across the World

Japan. Over the course of twenty years, Japan has struggled with bringing down recidivism rates across the nation. Their rate has stayed around 50 percent consistently since the 2000s, even though the country has reported a much lower rate of crime (Kishi et al., 2018). Out of all the crimes committed, the two that result in people recidivating the most are either property or drug crimes (Kishi et al., 2018). Although their culture and criminal justice system are much different from that of the United States, Japan is still seeing the same patterns that cause many worldwide to recidivate.

Similar socioeconomic and psychological factors that lead people back to prison include unemployment, poor education, insufficient social support, and the stigma found within society. Along with these factors, psychological characteristics can also contribute to the likelihood of recidivism. Kishi et al. (2018) found evidence of this by using a “sense of coherence” scale, which can be described as someone’s ability to deal with or cope with stress by using manageability, comprehensibility, and meaningfulness (Kase, 2023). In this case, Kishi et al. (2018) focused specifically on manageability since it was identified to be a possible contributor to recidivism. Manageability is determined by whether a person can healthily handle stress

(Kishi et al., 2018). When people do not have the skills to deal with large amounts of stress—especially stress associated with trying to re-enter back into society—it can make it difficult to cope, leading people to go back to what they know through criminal activities (Kishi et al., 2018).

Additional psychological factors stem from criminological theories, specifically the “big four,” which are personality, criminal associates, antisocial cognition, and developmental history (Andrews et al., 2006). Antisocial cognition is one of the more severe conditions that affect people who tend to recidivate (Kishi et al., 2018). This type of cognition bolsters the belief that one must participate in criminal activities due to a collective attitude found within correctional facilities (Walters & DeLisi, 2013). Studies have shown a link between antisocial cognition and aggressive behavior, and more aggression leads to frustration, resulting in more crimes being committed (Kishi et al., 2018). One example of this was seen in a violent case in the early 2000s that was committed by an ex-convict (Minoura, 2018). It brought much-needed attention to the Japanese prison system and the need for change within it.

The Ministry of Justice responded to the violent cases by implementing more parole officers, reducing the number of cases assigned to each officer, and creating specialized programs for training (Japan Ministry, 2023). The parole officers in Japan, or professional probation officers (PPOs), work directly with inmates and volunteer probation officers (VPOs) (Minoura, 2018). This is one aspect that is much different from the U.S. since they are rarely utilized or talked about (Akashi, 2018). After trying to research VPOs in the U.S., the results only showed applications and places looking for more volunteers. Very few articles discuss them, and the ones that do are outdated. In Japan, the volunteer probation officers work under professional probation officers, so there is a hierarchy down to the inmates. The PPOs help

assign treatment plans for rehabilitation, and the VPOs help assist by supervising the inmates they are assigned to with the treatment plan (Minoura, 2018). Having volunteer probation officers provides the inmates with a less intimidating resource and someone who can treat them more like human beings and friends rather than a superior (Akashi, 2018).

If Japan has such a good probation program, why is there still a disproportionate rate of recidivism? Japan's court system is extremely flawed in the fact that it has a 99.8 percent conviction rate (Ijaz, 2023). There is quite a bit of debate over whether this court system falsely arrests innocent people because of the high rate, and some even refer to the system as "hostage justice" (Ijaz, 2023). Some blame the conviction rate on the fact that prosecutors only pursue cases if they know the defendant is "guilty" or there is sufficient evidence supporting the conviction (Japan Ministry, 2023). The prosecutors have an excessive amount of power that allows them to withhold evidence supporting the defendant's case due to a lack of a pretrial discovery process (Kambayashi, 2023). The possibility of someone returning to prison is very high since it is so difficult to be proven innocent. Another contributor to the likelihood of recidivism comes from the prosecutor's ability to invoke multiple arrests, which means that someone can be arrested for multiple charges while already in custody (Ijaz, 2023). Japanese police do this to lengthen the amount of time the defendant spends in custody, allowing them to further build on the case.

Overall, Japan has both problems and solutions to the fight against recidivism. Certain areas need more research than others. The criminal justice system needs to be analyzed and studied further to determine whether the legal system is fair for everyone and what can be changed to help this. Volunteer probation officers are a great resource in helping reduce recidivism, and they should be considered more in the United States. The Ministry of Justice of

Japan has an up-to-date website that does a great job of informing people about what recidivism is and how it can be prevented (Japan Ministry, 2023). Similar socioeconomic and psychological factors that contribute to recidivism can be found all over the world, but differences in judicial systems and rehabilitation program effectiveness also play a major role in affecting rates.

The Philippines. Like Japan, the Philippines recidivism rate has remained around 47.9 percent (Abalos, 2023). Although the rates are similar in percentage, the reason as to why is much different. Overpopulation is one of the most pressing issues affecting inmates in the Philippines. Jones (2014) states that prisons and jails together make up an almost 300 percent rate of congestion within the institutions. The Philippines ranks third in the world for overcrowding of their inmates (“Philippines Addresses,” 2023). Prisons and jails in the Philippines tripled the number of capacities, which of course leads to horrible prison conditions. To add to the severity of the overcrowding, almost two-thirds of the population located in the prisons are only being held on preventive detention, meaning that they have not been convicted yet (“Philippines Addresses,” 2023). The duration of the waiting period before a person’s actual trial is unknown to many, and they must live with this uncertainty while living in horrible prison conditions. Those who are innocent would have to be incarcerated as well. This is completely unjust and violates their rights to defend themselves.

The quality of life for inmates in the Philippines is horrific due to the circumstances of overcrowding, underfunding, and understaffing (Narag & Jones, 2017). Overcrowding is perhaps the main issue associated with the high amount of recidivism in the country. Prisons and jails were already overpopulated before 2016, but the president of the Philippines started a drug war that greatly increased the number of inmates within these facilities due to drug-related arrests (Nario-Lopez, 2020). During this time frame, when many people were arrested or turned

themselves in, the capacity rate rose to almost 600 percent with large intakes (The Prison Insider, 2019). The drug war may have had good intentions, but it certainly did not help the people living in correctional facilities. Most of the drug-related cases are minor, and they fill the facilities with low-level criminals who are nonviolent ("Philippines Addresses," 2023). With the increase in inmates, prisons and jails had to increase the amount of space provided by creating multi-occupancy cells. Within these cells, they are so small that instead of using the ten-person capacity recommendation, they are filled up with almost 100 inmates (Narag & Jones, 2017). The close physical contact and proximity of all inmates prevent anyone from having any privacy or personal space. They are forced to deal with it and adapt to the terrible living conditions. Since there are so many people within the facilities, they must be able to feed everyone, and this is difficult to do because the excess of people is not built into the budget (Alipoyo, 2022).

Underfunding in the Philippine prison system causes facility conditions to be extremely poor and detrimental to the health of the inmates within them. First, with overcrowding already being a huge problem for the inmates, local executives along with government leaders in positions of power do not provide enough funding to house that many people (Barrera, 2020). They believe that people who end up in prison do not deserve basic necessities required to survive because they broke the law. Like the United States, policymakers find that punitive justice should be utilized to reduce recidivism, meaning that they believe punishment is more successful than rehabilitation (Barrera, 2020). The poor prison conditions are included with the punishment of incarceration. This explains why they have not added more cells or space to the correctional facilities to continue the prolonged suffering of inmates (Valenzuela, 2016).

Overcrowding requires more water and food to feed all the prisoners, yet there are barely enough funds to provide quality resources. Without access to a well-stocked supply, competition

between inmates occurs, leading to increased problems of gangs within prisons and resource-related conflict (Alipoyo, 2022). The additional problem of understaffing these facilities only fosters the possibility of inner conflicts among inmates. Not having enough guards to minimize fighting allows it to occur, thus creating a hostile environment.

The management of the staff itself also contributes to the abhorrent conditions of correctional facilities in the Philippines. One study done by Nkala & Malataliana (2021) describes how the training for staff members is insufficient and “flawed” with a lack of human resources to help. Low salaries contribute to low morale, which decreases efficiency (Nkala & Malataliana, 2021). Since the inmates have increasing cases involving conflict and rioting, the safety of guards and other staff members decreases. All in all, every problem creates a hostile environment for everyone involved, not just the inmates.

There is much work to be done in Filipino correctional facilities. The recidivism rate remains so high because of the prison conditions and hostile environment. Inmates have little hope of returning to society, and those who do return are very likely to be incarcerated once more due to a lack of rehabilitative programs offered during incarceration.

Finland. The differences found between Finland and other Western countries are significant and drastic. Comparing Finland with the United States, the states incarcerate ten times more people than in Finland (Miller et al., 2022). With a recidivism rate of about 36 percent, Finland has created a prison system that is much more favorable toward rehabilitation and reform (Aaltonen, 2017).

Prison conditions in Scandinavian countries differ greatly from North America. Linderborg et al. (2012) conducted interviews with prisoners residing in Finnish prisons and discussed their opinions on the prison conditions. The results yielded from the study indicate that

they felt safe, the staff was respectful in their treatment of the prisoners, and the prisons were kept clean and tidy (Linderborg et al., 2012). The United States has almost the complete opposite views from their prisoners. Staff members in the U.S. have been shown to treat prisoners as less human by ignoring their needs, which leads to more conflict and stress that has detrimental effects over time (Miller et al., 2022). It weakens the relationship between authority figures and prisoners, creating a harmful divide that could fester frustration and hate. With more of a divide, the prisoners form closer bonds with one another since they are fighting against the same guards, forming a hostile environment that welcomes conflict. As a result, the punishments used in the two countries also contrast with one another.

Finland utilizes moderate punishments rather than severe, along with the use of noncustodial sanctions (Miller et al., 2022). In other words, rather than incarcerating inmates, Finland wants to “decarcerate” their inmates, keeping the prison populations small and easily manageable (Moran & Keinänen, 2012). Fines can be applied for small, nonviolent crimes to help save money for the prisons, allowing them to use the money towards other treatment programs or the quality of the prisons themselves. Other noncustodial options include community service and other methods of confinement with electronic monitoring and supervising (Miller et al., 2022).

Another interesting aspect of the Finland prison system is the concept of open and closed facilities. According to the Prison and Probation Service of Finland, out of the 28 facilities located in the country, the inmates are divided with 70 percent of the population located in closed prisons and 30 percent in open prisons, otherwise known as units (Prison Probation, 2023). Open prisons are essentially a means to obtain and practice autonomy, like living in a dorm room where each person is held accountable (Bichell, 2015). Miller et al. (2022) describe how open

prisons can help inmates find their footing in the world before returning to society. At the start of most prisoners' sentences, they typically reside in closed facilities depending on the severity of the crime they committed. Then, they take "leave" by moving into open prisons for a transitional period, and finally, they reintegrate back into society following release (Miller et al., 2022). In both types of prisons, each person has the responsibility to participate in either work or school. Everyone is held accountable by requiring them to clean their own living space (Miller et al., 2022). Other activities, such as exercising or reading, are readily available. A close to "normal" lifestyle in the Finnish prison system makes adjusting to prison life much more seamless and leaving even easier.

The most interesting comparison found between Finland and the United States is the normalization of the prison system. Villman (2023) discusses how normal conditions in prison help to promote socially acceptable behaviors that will help in the future when it is time to reintegrate. Even though incarceration is meant to take away certain liberties and freedoms, Finland focuses on reform rather than punishment. By providing autonomy and trust that the prisoners will follow protocols, they require less surveillance and supervision. This gives more time and attention to the inmates who need more help than others.

Norway. At an astounding 20 percent rate of recidivism, Norway has one of the lowest recidivism rates in the world (Aaltonen et al., 2017). Like Finland, Norway has many factors that significantly reduce the rate of recidivism. These factors influence social policies put in place by the government, leading to a reduction of societal stigma surrounding formerly incarcerated individuals, and they contribute to the implementation of more humane methods of treatment toward prisoners (Labutta, 2017).

Social policies in the Scandinavian countries have been put in place to fight inequality among their citizens, especially with economic disparities (Labutta, 2017). Other rights to important health care ensure that each person can receive affordable medical assistance. Access to affordable education opportunities allows anyone to pursue a degree, lessening unemployment rates. Most people who end up in prison in the U.S. are already affected by the lack of social policies before they are even incarcerated, which puts them at an even higher disadvantage than they already were. According to Tranaes and Geerdsen (2008), people who were incarcerated had a two times higher chance of unemployment. Norway has many preventions that allow people to get back on their feet if they are struggling with employment or financial troubles. Pension is provided, and poverty is greatly reduced. Aaltonen et al. (2017) discuss the high rates of employment in Norway, and Norway's employment after incarceration proves that the system helps to reduce recidivism since the country has the highest number of jobs found after the first year of being released. Having social and welfare policies does great in preventing crime since people do not have to resort to illegal activities to make money (Labutta, 2017).

Norway and its people have much different views on ex-convicts compared to harsher countries like the United States. The societal stigma that follows the formerly incarcerated in the U.S. is extremely harmful to one's sense of self, and it creates many barriers to rebuilding their lives and reconnecting with friends and family. In Norway, stigma is reduced greatly using confidentiality, especially for employment (Andvig et al., 2021). Employers do not have access to criminal records unless requested, making it much easier to obtain employment following release (Andvig et al., 2021). Even sex offenders do not have to be registered to the public, and their criminal records remain sealed except for special circumstances (Sandbukt, 2023). The main difference between the Norwegian prison system and the United States is the fact that the

inmates still have access to all their rights except for their liberty. They can vote and have access to healthcare and other educational opportunities (Kirby, 2019). Norway's main goal of rehabilitation is to keep humanity intact within their prisoners. They are still human beings, and when you do not treat them as such, they will not act like humans (Kirby, 2019).

Andvig et al. (2021) studied the "prison island," or Bastøy Prison, where they identified the main aspects that kept inmates from leaving the open prison, and eventually what kept inmates from returning after release. Their findings identified what the attitude and environment look like at the prison, and they found that it promoted humanity and friendships between inmates and staff (Andvig et al., 2021). There was not a large power gap where authority figures abused their power but rather an understanding and respect towards one another. Other conditions encourage individual autonomy and responsibility with activities such as raising farm animals, farming plants and crops, cooking food for other inmates, mechanics, and an assortment of other jobs that keep the prison running (Nagy, 2014). The First Step Alliance, a nonprofit organization that advances education and successful reentry for former incarcerates, found that Bastøy Prison allows inmates to visit their spouses and families. Continuing and furthering inmates' relationships with their families gives them much more motivation to finish their sentences and return home. It also ensures that they have people to go home to when they are released.

Approaches to Recidivism in the United States

The United States criminal justice system houses the most prisoners than anywhere else in the world (Statista, 2024). This is such a staggering statistic since the U.S. has less than five percent of the overall global population, yet it is home to a quarter of the entire world's prisoners (Desmarais et al., 2018). With that many prisoners, it makes sense to why the recidivism rate in

the U.S. is almost 68 percent (Alper et al., 2018). Why is that the case? Most research has pointed to the lack of financial assistance within the country (Costopoulos et al., 2017). The number of citizens who face poverty regularly is extreme, and although there are assistance programs available, most of them are short-term and provide the bare minimum (Costopoulos et al., 2017). A study done by Hall et al. (2015) studied 15 states, and that research found that most people reoffend for financial reasons. The two most common crimes by people who recidivate are robbery and burglary (Hall et al., 2015). That alone shows that money is a leading factor causing the high recidivism rate. As stated earlier, when formerly incarcerated individuals do not have access to stable housing, employment, or education, it increases the chances of being re-arrested. Another main contributing factor is the disenfranchisement of rights. Taking away people's civic duties and rights creates all sorts of problems, and most of this can be explained by how the U.S. utilizes punishment over rehabilitation.

The type of punishment used in the U.S. stems from the theory of deterrence. The classic deterrence theory interprets punishment as something that should be equal to the crime committed to help deter criminals from breaking the same laws again (Tomlinson, 2016). The theory uses three main concepts: certainty, severity, and celerity (Miller et al., 2022). When deterrence theory came to light, most theorists believed that having a quick, severe punishment would reprimand the offenders enough to where they would not commit the same crime(s) over again (Tomlinson, 2016). This is not the case. As seen in the United States where deterrence theory makes up the foundation of the criminal justice system, the high incarceration rate reflects the ineffectiveness of the theory (Miller et al., 2022). Most punishments that result from being incarcerated in the U.S. include long prison sentences, poor living conditions, lack of reentry and treatment programs, and poor relationships among prisoners and staff members, all of which are

custodial sanctions (Cullen et al., 2011). One especially harmful punishment is solitary confinement.

Solitary confinement is a very common punitive practice in the United States criminal justice system, but most other countries stray away from it. It can be defined as “the practice of isolating people from the general prison population” (Matei, 2022). There are four types of confinement, including protective custody, temporary segregation, administrative segregation, and disciplinary segregation (Matei, 2022). This practice can be described as inhumane due to the main use of isolation. Humans are social, and when the ability to socialize with another person is taken away, it is immensely damaging to the person’s mental health. The psychological trauma that results from isolation is detrimental, and in some cases, it increases the chances of recidivism (Tsui, 2017). Data from states in the U.S. indicate that inmates who receive solitary confinement were more likely to be rearrested following release as compared to inmates who did not receive the punishment (Tsui, 2017). Solitary confinement and isolation are examples of many that show how this type of punishment increases the chances of recidivism.

It is no surprise that so many people in the U.S. tend to recidivate based on the conditions and barriers that they go through before and after being released.

South Dakota. The South Dakota Department of Corrections (SDDOC) utilizes a three-year model along with these risk measurements to identify and supervise former offenders for three years after they are released from jail or prison. In South Dakota, 40.3 percent of formerly incarcerated individuals return to prison following three years of release due to technical parole violations or new convictions (SDDOC, 2023). If almost half of these individuals are recidivating, it indicates that the anti-recidivism and re-entry programs in South Dakota may not

be doing enough. Almost 95 percent of inmates are due to be released, so recidivism is an important consideration for the entire state (SDDOC, 2023).

In 2012, South Dakota initiated the Criminal Justice Initiative Work Group to generate change in the criminal justice system. The group consisted of all sorts of departments related to recidivism, including legislators, prosecutors and defense attorneys, and other social services (Elderbroom et al., 2016). They then gathered data from the entire state, which found two main contributors to recidivism. Many South Dakotan inmates committed nonviolent crimes of drug-related abuse and addiction (Elderbroom et al., 2016). Rather than the distribution and sale of said drugs, most people were incarcerated for possession. The other factor indicated that 25 percent of the prison population was incarcerated due to a parole revocation (Elderbroom et al., 2016). As a result, Governor Dugaard approved the Public Safety Improvement Act in 2013 to help reduce incarceration of nonviolent offenses, and prison growth, and in turn use the funds that will be saved to invest in re-integrative programs (Elderbroom et al., 2016). Although the state tried to decrease recidivism through the passing of that act, it was not enough to curb the trend. Following the approved act was a large increase in felony convictions related to drug offenses, which indicates that the system is not doing enough (Elderbroom et al., 2016).

One specific group that was disproportionately represented within the criminal justice system was the Native American population in South Dakota. While the Native American population only makes up about nine percent of South Dakota's overall population, in the jails, 41 percent were Native (2015), and in prisons, 33 percent of people were Native (2017) (Vera, 2019). This is extremely disproportionate compared to other races within the state facilities (Improving Reentry, 2021). Before the passing of Senate Bill 70 (Public Safety Improvement Act), members of Native American tribes who were released on parole were barred from going

back to their tribe, meaning that they were forced to relocate from their community (Moreno, 2014). If their entire support system was located within their tribe, it multiplied the chances of recidivism. This took away stable housing, job opportunities, and familial relationships. Also, parole officers did not have access or jurisdiction to tribal lands, so they would have to relocate the former inmates (Moreno, 2014). With the passing of SB 70, it allowed a pilot program to form which authorized “post-release supervision” within the tribal lands (Moreno, 2014).

If the passing of SB 70 was meant to reduce recidivism in the state of South Dakota, why has the rate remained the same over the years? Where is the predicted change? The Justice Reinvestment Initiative (JRI) did a follow-up on the state and its well-being, and even though a few areas improved, it was hardly enough to make an impactful change (Harvell et al., 2019). More recent implications involve adding educational programs, such as the Individual Growth Naturally and Intentionally Through Education (IGNITE) program initiated in 2023 (Pfankuch, 2023). This program has been seen in other surrounding states like Michigan, and the results show the rehabilitation and reform elements provided by the program. It offers job training, education to obtain the GED, and other counseling opportunities (Pfankuch, 2023). IGNITE benefits both the inmates and the state itself. While helping to develop self-confidence within the inmates, it also helps to reduce the job shortage of the state by providing employment following release (Pfankuch, 2023). This program is a great start in allowing inmates to get a head start on reintegrating back into society before and after release.

One explanation as to why the rate has remained somewhat consistent could be from legislation that was signed by Governor Noem. In 2023, 390 million dollars was put towards the South Dakota prison system with most of the funds being allocated for the addition of new prison facilities (Biraben, 2023). Rather than investing in recidivism prevention measures through

evidence-based treatment programs, Governor Noem is preparing to house more prisoners. Moreover, a recent bill that was introduced was designed to create more programs for job training and reintegration while inmates are incarcerated. This bill, Senate Bill 74, was rejected and opposed by the Secretary of the Department of Corrections, Kellie Wasko (Walton, 2024). Wasko's reasoning for the rejection was that the programs would not be specific to the needs of inmates within the state of South Dakota (Walton, 2024). If the state representatives of South Dakota are against reintegrative reform and change, how is the rate supposed to improve?

South Dakota legislative members need to do more to advocate for inmates and former inmates to help reduce the rate of re-incarceration. The programs that are already in place are not doing enough, and more policies should be enacted with recidivism in mind. Instead of building more facilities to house prisoners, legislators should invest more into rehabilitation programs, so there will not be a need for more space.

Other States.

Alaska. In the United States, Alaska is seen as having the worst recidivism rate barely above Delaware's rate at 61.6 percent (World Population, 2023). Alaska uses a risk assessment study called the Level of Service Inventory-Revised (LSI-R) to calculate the risk of certain individuals committing future crimes. Inmates are interviewed and questioned about their illegal activities or the possibility of reoffending. Other calculations come from the Alaska Justice Information Center (AJiC), which started the Alaska Results First (RF) analysis in 2007, and they studied recidivism across a span of eight years to 2015. They focused on four common crimes committed in the state, including domestic violence, felony DUIs, sex offenders, and misdemeanor DUIs (Velle, 2018). Among the four types, domestic violence was determined to be the most likely crime to be recidivated (Velle, 2018). The next most common crime was both

felony and misdemeanor DUIs with the felony having a higher rate after a longer period (Velle, 2018). A common problem of substance abuse recidivism has been identified across the state of Alaska, and that is reflected in the results of the RF analysis.

According to the Alaska Department of Corrections (2017), practically 80 percent of inmates struggle with substance abuse. When these individuals do recidivate and end up back in the system, 92 percent of them require some type of treatment program to help them cope with the disorder (Set Free Model). Recently, the state of Alaska has implemented certain programs to combat the substance abuse disorders seen in the inmates. The Set-Free Model, which is based on the criminogenic needs theory, uses four different phases in helping former incarcerates. These include reentry, recovery, reintegration, and restoration. Phase one of reentry utilizes peer support from surrounding communities with those who have overcome addiction and other various criminal behaviors to relate with the inmates. In addition to peer support, therapeutic housing is provided to participants to create a smooth transition for when the inmates are released (Ray & Madison, 2023). Phase two focuses on substance abuse treatment and individualized care plans for the special needs of each inmate. Phase three started the reintegrative process by providing educational and employment opportunities through connections in the community. Finally, Phase Four continued and furthered individualized support for those who need it. To know whether the program was effective, Set Free Alaska conducted a study that lasted 18 months (Ray & Madison, 2023). The results were significant in reducing recidivism among the selected sample as the rate went from 66.4 percent to 21.8 percent (Ray & Madison, 2023). Further studies should obtain larger sample sizes to ensure that the data and statistics are accurate.

With the addition of these recent treatment programs, why is the rate still so high? An explanation could point towards poor prison conditions. Understaffing correctional facilities in Alaska has led to the closure of the Seward Community Jail, pushing the inmates who were housed there to surrounding facilities that are farther away from their support system (Williams, 2023). The Palmer Correctional Facility had the same issue in 2016 and suffered from being understaffed, ultimately leading to its closure. Strangely, they recently reopened the facility in 2021, and they are planning on housing inmates to the maximum capacity (AP, 2021). This could lead to overcrowding issues if the population continues to increase.

Other discrimination issues have led to a disproportionate number of Natives being incarcerated compared to the general population in the state. This is reflected in other states with a high native population, such as South Dakota. While Alaskan Natives make up only 14 percent of the Alaskan population, they contribute 40 percent of incarcerated people in the state (McBride, 2023). Myrstol, a researcher at the University of Alaska Anchorage Justice Center, states that these disparities are traced back to the structure of the unified prison system, meaning that prisons and jails are combined due to the smaller population of the state (McBride, 2023). As a marginalized group, Alaskan Natives are more affected by poverty, which prohibits them from paying out bail (McBride, 2023). Other problems with a lack of mental health resources in reservations make it difficult for Natives to receive needed treatment (Davis, 2021). Without treatment, it leads to criminal behavior and increased incarceration rates. Many risk measurements also do not account for the indigenous population's perspective, so they are made without them in mind (Davis, 2021).

There have been many efforts to reduce recidivism in Alaska, but they are simply not doing enough. The fixes are only temporary, and recent years have shown that the rate has

remained consistent. More improvements for treatment programs within facilities must be implemented, and more considerations for the possibility of parole for nonviolent offenders would help reduce prison populations with less overcrowding.

Delaware. Delaware has one of the highest rates of recidivism in the United States with an astonishing 60.2 percent of former incarcerates recidivating after three years (World Population, 2023). The state has not done well with keeping track of rates throughout the years, and before 2013, the only recent report they had was done in 2000 and was based on statistics from the 80s and 90s (Carrasquillo, 2015). Delaware is also one of six states that participate in a “unified prison system” where all jails, prisons, detention centers, and other various detention methods are combined into one group in four facilities (Criminion, 2024). This is typically used in states with a smaller population of people, like the unified prison system seen in Alaska. The other states participating in this system are Rhode Island, Hawaii, Vermont, and Connecticut (Criminion, 2024).

Recidivism rates in Delaware are measured by looking at rearrest rates, recommitment, and reconviction rates (DCJC, 2013). According to the Delaware Criminal Justice Center (2013), the most common offenses that lead to recidivism are serious misdemeanors, felonies, or violation of parole or probation. Public order offenses are also included, and the most frequent were dealing drugs, robbery, burglary, and finally weapon offenses. The rate was then calculated based on the formula below:

$$\text{Interval Recidivism Rate} = \frac{\# \text{ of Recidivists}}{(\# \text{ of Recidivists}) + (\# \text{ of Non-recidivists})} * 100\%$$

A study done on the Delaware Correctional System provided insights to recidivism rates from 2008 and 2009. The findings found a high rate, so further action was required and delivered through the Delaware Residential Re-entry Center (RRC). The RRC is a program made to help those released, but it can only house up to 24 people at a time, so the program only helps a limited number of people (Carrasquillo, 2015).

Two main factors affecting inmates in Delaware correctional facilities are solitary confinement and overcrowding. In 2015, three different agencies teamed up to sue Delaware prisons for confining almost 100 people to solitary confinement (Reyes, 2016). Solitary confinement has been shown to increase mental illness, and it is considered cruel and unusual punishment when inmates are held for more than 15 days (Reyes, 2015). Inmates with mental illnesses are not provided with adequate treatment, and most are punished for “bad behavior” when the cause of the behavior stems from their poor mental health (Reyes, 2015). As of 2017, the Bureau of Justice Statistics determined that Delaware ranked fifth in the U.S. for overcrowding (Guerin, 2017). Overcrowding leads to poor prison conditions, which tends to decrease the quality of life for prisoners. If the correctional facilities do not offset overcrowding, it could lead to understaffing issues and an imbalanced ratio of guards to prisoners. Both overcrowding and solitary confinement seriously affect the mental health of Delaware prisoners, and without proper treatment, it will continue to affect them following release. This could explain the high recidivism rate in the state.

The state has tried to reduce the rate through a series of grants and blueprints. One grant in 2019 offered 1.5 million dollars to provide individualized transition plans for those who are close to release (Eichmann, 2019). Along with transitional plans, more employment opportunities through local employers were provided, and behavioral therapy was offered too (Eichmann,

2019). Recent efforts by the Delaware Correctional Reentry Commission were made to create a “blueprint” for 2021-2024 to reduce recidivism. The blueprint worked to improve employment and education, medical and behavioral health, and stable housing for the formerly incarcerated. It is still too soon to see whether the results helped to reduce the rate, but hopefully, the efforts will show some signs of improvement.

Texas. Surprisingly, the rate of recidivism in Texas stands at 20.3 percent as of 2022 (TDCJ). The lowest rates of recidivism in the United States come from two completely different states, Texas, and Oregon (World Population, 2023). The attitudes of each are practically opposite from one another, and the methods of government and corrections also vary widely. Texas implemented a Reentry Task Force, which works with other correctional departments to focus on reducing recidivism (TDCJ, 2022). Attention to employment following release, behavioral health and needs, homelessness, and even veteran assistance help inmates find their footing before they are released. The Texas Department of Criminal Justice (TDCJ) also partnered with the Management and Training Corporation (MTC), and since then, the programs offered to inmates have helped significantly stop them from returning to the criminal justice system (“Texas Reduced”, 2020). When the state dealt with rising recidivism rates in 2007, instead of building more prisons to house more inmates, they took a different approach that can be seen in today’s recidivism rate (“Texas Reduced”, 2020).

First, to understand why the recidivism rate is so low in Texas, the methods of measuring rates must be known. In 2013, the Council of State Governments Justice Center started the *County Uniform Recidivism Measure Project*, which is used to evaluate county trends to enable a comparison across counties. Specifically, they use a uniform methodology that identifies counties needing more assistance to improve policies (2013). The tracking period focuses on the

one, two-, and three years following release from prison. The project first identified certain counties within Texas to study, and it later furthered the research into state populations (2013). Having a uniform methodology to measure the risk of recidivating across the entire state provides accurate and consistent findings to identify problem areas that need more support. Once this was developed, it allowed policymakers to create a system for rehabilitation within prisons.

The Reentry and Integration Division uses a three-phase program to do so. Phase one is where the inmate is assigned to a “reentry case manager,” and the manager helps figure out logistics and paperwork (“Breaking Cycle”, 2023). Documents like driver’s licenses, social security cards, and other identification forms are important for reintegration, and some inmates need extra help in finding and creating these. For phase two, the case manager establishes the risk assessment to find the risk of reoffending, and based on that, they develop a treatment plan depending on the amount of risk (“Breaking Cycle”, 2023). Inmates are given goals to find success in reentering society. Finally, phase three focuses mainly on employment. This is the most important phase since it will determine whether the inmate will feel secure and stable following release (“Breaking Cycle”, 2023). Interview skills, housing options, and job search are done for the specific inmate. The three-phase program alone is more effort than in other states in the U.S., and the effectiveness shows itself in the low recidivism rate.

Oregon. According to the World Population Review, in 2022, Oregon’s three-year recidivism rate was at 13.1 percent. This rate was found by the Oregon Criminal Justice Commission (CJC), and they study three components to track recidivism. The components include an arrest for a new crime, conviction of said crime, and finally, incarceration (McAlister et al., 2022). Oregon has been found to spend a lot on inmates, which can account for the investment in reducing recidivism (BJS, 2022). They spend their budgets on providing

successful evidence-based programs to inmates. These include addiction treatment programs, job skill building, career finding, and coping strategies for dealing with struggles in life (“Criminion International”, 2024). Like Texas, each inmate is assigned to a case manager to work individually based on the specific needs of each person. This allows them to focus on what programs are going to help them the best.

Something specific to Oregon is the concept of early release. One program called Short-Term Transitional Leave (STTL) is designed to require treatment program completion, maintenance of good behavior, and excellence in different work assignments to allow a period of leave (“Short-term Transitional,” n.d.). To be eligible to receive STTL, one must be within six months of release, and they will have an assigned release counselor. The release counselor assists the inmate with developing a release plan, ensuring that the inmate will be prepared for reintegration. The plan can only be approved by the county, so it must be well thought out and structured to account for transitional barriers. If granted, an inmate can be released almost 120 days (about 4 months) before their set release date (“Short-term Transitional,” n.d.). A violation of the STTL will result in the inmate being returned to prison for the remainder of the sentence or a longer period depending on the severity of the violation.

The concept of early release works as a great motivator to encourage good behavior from inmates, and since it requires the completion of recommended programs, those who participate would hopefully be less likely to recidivate. The recommended programs are a part of the Alternative Incarceration Program (AIP), and the two main ones focus on cognitive behavioral therapy and/or an intense substance abuse prevention program (“Early Release”, 2020). Each program lasts for at least 270 days (about 9 months), and each day must have a strict routine that is followed for 14 hours minimum (Department Corrections, 2024). Early release programs boost

inmate motivation, and they reduce overcrowding and taxpayer costs, so they benefit both community members and the financial costs of the prisons themselves (O'Hear, 2015).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This literature analysis and review provided insights into the reasons why South Dakota's recidivism rate has remained high for years. The study compared the existing state resocialization methods to other states within the U.S., the United States itself, and four other countries with differing rates of recidivism. At each location, various recidivism methods and measures were used, meaning most of the rates were based on various calculations. Some areas did not track certain years, which in turn led to some missing data. There were various cultures among the spread of locations that influenced certain policies and criminal justice styles.

Policy Recommendations

The United States requires many policy recommendations to instigate reform in the criminal justice system. Firstly, the very basis of the penal system stems from the theory of deterrence which utilizes punishment over rehabilitation. With the removal of civic rights through disenfranchisement, doing so makes inmates feel less than others. After release, the formerly incarcerated cannot participate in civic duties that bring people together as a community. Voting is an important right that provides the people with a voice in decision-making. By taking that voice away from ex-convicts, it creates a disconnect between them and America, and they may feel as though they do not belong. To combat this, the United States should enfranchise the formerly incarcerated since they are still U.S. citizens who have as much of a right to vote and participate in their civic duties as anyone else does.

Other barriers that the formerly incarcerated deal with involve employment opportunities. Most employers can discriminate against ex-convicts by denying them solely based on their criminal record. They do not need to know what the crime was or why it was committed, so they just assume that the person is bad only because of a criminal record. Without having the full story, employers should not be able to deny employment. Countries like Norway and Finland seal criminal records so employers do not have access whatsoever. The U.S. should take note of this and at least try to “ban the box” and remove the requirement to show a criminal record. It is personal and damaging to the person, and they should have a right to tell their side of the story before others make assumptions.

Before inmates are released back into society, more precautions and preparations should be taken by creating a uniform risk assessment that can be used across the country. Measuring recidivism rates is a struggle when every state uses a different risk assessment for inmates. More research into a well-defined risk assessment will help to develop a better understanding of high-severity inmates compared to low-severity. This will allow case managers to establish a treatment plan for individual inmates. Also, it will provide more accurate data that can be compared from state to state. An improved risk assessment would benefit inmates directly by knowing whether they would be prepared to be released early or have their sentence reduced. Early release can be motivated by participation in rehabilitative programs. Both the correctional facility and the inmates would directly benefit from this since they would receive the help they need, and early release would reduce the costs of housing more inmates for longer. Reduced sentences have the same effect financially. For inmates with much longer sentences, a reduction in time would provide some psychological relief and hope that they could build a better life.

Finally, the United States would benefit from more noncustodial sanctions rather than custodial sanctions. Noncustodial sanctions would include more fines, probation, volunteer or community service hours, and other various methods that would not require incarceration. These sanctions could be used for low-level nonviolent crimes that do not pose any threat to anyone else. This would reduce the punishment factor and give people a second chance before locking them away.

To improve the high recidivism rate in South Dakota, structural changes in both correctional facilities and reentry programs need to be made in the reintegrative process. While inmates are still incarcerated, education programs offered will help to improve education levels for finding employment following release. Paired with education, employment opportunities can be made available by outsourcing to local employers who need more workers. Training while incarcerated would allow inmates to start working immediately after release, and employers would have a sure way to find more help. Other considerations for educational programs could offer financial informational sessions to help inmates with money management. Financial literacy is important, especially with a vulnerable population, and this would greatly benefit people post-incarceration.

As for rehabilitative programs, substance abuse and mental health are the leading issues affecting inmates in South Dakota. Counseling is essential to provide support to inmates who do not have it. If they do not have family nearby, it can be hard to find the motivation to continue improving oneself. Based on programs from the Scandinavian Peninsula, promoting self-confidence and individuality has many benefits for inmates' self-esteem. They cannot better themselves without good self-esteem, therefore, counseling should encompass these aspects. Community involvement has also been shown to benefit inmates during and after incarceration

with rehabilitative programs involving substance abuse. South Dakota correctional facilities could consider bringing in peer support through people in surrounding communities who are willing to help and have dealt with addiction before. Rather than putting all the work on the parole officers, peer support would provide a friend who is not in a position of power. They could relate on a personal level, and it may hold formerly incarcerated individuals more accountable. They would not just have to be for individuals affected by substance abuse. For those who do not have family nearby or at all, peer support would allow inmates to find good connections within the community, and they would have people to come back to once released.

Both South Dakota and the United States would benefit from incorporating normalization. As seen in Norway and Finland, they use a combination of noncustodial sanctions and normalization to treat inmates more humanely. Prisons should be set up in a way that allows inmates to have normal daily activities to simulate life on the outside. It helps create a healthy routine that deters inmates from behaving badly. It also reduces the possibility of dehumanization where inmates who feel that they are being treated unjustly associate themselves with criminal behaviors.

REFERENCES

- Aaltonen, M., Skardhamar, T., Nilsson, A., Højsgaard Andersen, L., Bäckman, O., Estrada, F., & Danielsson, P. (2017). Comparing Employment Trajectories before and after First Imprisonment in Four Nordic Countries. *British Journal of Criminology*, 57(4), 828-847. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azw026>
- Abalos, J. C. (2023, May 5). Explanatory note. House of Representatives. https://hrep-website.s3.ap-southeast-1.amazonaws.com/legisdocs/basic_19/HB07938.pdf
- Akashi, F. (2018). The role of volunteer probation officers in Japan - Recent challenges and responses. *International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice*, 54, 121–132. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijlcrj.2018.03.006>
- Alaska Criminal Justice Data Analysis Commission. (2023, November 1). *2023 Annual Report*. Alaska Judicial Council; Alaska Criminal Justice Data Analysis Commission. https://www.ajc.state.ak.us/datacommission/docs/reports/DAC_2023_Annual_Report.p
- Alaska prison reopens amid criticism from reform advocates*. (2021, August 11). AP NEWS. <https://apnews.com/article/business-health-prisons-alaska-coronavirus-pandemic-b8a8c47aaa32ba1e99450fef815fd5e7>
- Alipoyo, V. R. I. (2022). Conditions of Correctional Facilities in the Philippines: Jail Wardens' Perspectives and Experiences. *Otoritas : Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan*, 12(1), 67–77. <https://doi.org/10.26618/ojip.v12i1.6531>
- Alper, M., Durose, M., & Markman, J. (2018, May). *2018 Update on Prisoner Recidivism: A 9-Year Follow-up Period (2005-2014)*. Bureau of Justice Statistics; U.S. Department of Justice. <https://bjs.ojp.gov/library/publications/2018-update-prisoner-recidivism-9-year-follow-period-2005-2014>

Andvig, E., Koffeld-Hamidane, S., Ausland, L. H., & Karlsson, B. (2021). Inmates' perceptions and experiences of how they were prepared for release from a Norwegian open prison.

Nordic Journal of Criminology, 22(2), 203–220.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/2578983X.2020.1847954>

Baranger, J., Rousseau, D., Mastroilli, M. E., & Matesanz, J. (2018). Doing time wisely: The social and personal benefits of higher education in prison. *The Prison Journal*, 98(4), 490–513. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885518776380>

Barrera, D. J. S. (2021). Against Reductionism in the Philippine Criminal Justice System [Review of *Crime and Punishment in the Philippines: Beyond Politics and Spectacle*, by F. C. Gutierrez]. *Philippine Sociological Review*, 69, 145–150.

<https://www.jstor.org/stable/48719731>

Bichell, R. E. (2015, April 15). In Finland's "open prisons," inmates have the keys. *The World from PRX*. <https://theworld.org/stories/2015-04-15/finlands-open-prisons-inmates-have-keys>

Biraben, A. (2023, March 20). *South Dakota boosts criminal justice system investments*. AP

News. <https://apnews.com/article/south-dakota-criminal-justice-prisons-gov-noem-678aa460bcabbd99645abb3fc61ee0ea>

BJS. "Prisoners in 2020 – Statistical Tables." Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2022. [Bjs.ojp.gov](https://bjs.ojp.gov)

Braithwaite, J. (2000). *Reintegrative Shaming* [Review of *Reintegrative Shaming*]. Australian National University .

https://www0.anu.edu.au/fellows/jbraithwaite/_documents/Articles/Reintegrative%20Sha

[ming%20Explaining%20Criminals%20and%20Crime%20Essays%20in%20Contemporar
y%20Criminological%20Theory.pdf](#)

Breaking the Cycle of Recidivism: Understanding Causes & Solutions. (2023). Neal Davis Law Firm. <https://www.nealdavislaw.com/recidivism-causes-and-solutions/>

Butler, L., & Taylor, E. (2022, April). *A Second Chance: The Impact of Unsuccessful Reentry and the Need for Reintegration Resources in Communities.* Cops.usdoj.gov; U.S. Department of Justice. https://cops.usdoj.gov/html/dispatch/04-2022/reintegration_resources.html

Carrasquillo, S. (2015, May 14). *Crime, Recidivism, and Solutions in Delaware.* Community Solutions, Inc. <https://csi-online.org/crime-recidivism-and-solutions-in-delaware/>

Carson, E. A., Minton, T., & Zeng, Z. (2019, December). *Incarceration Trends in South Dakota.* Vera. Retrieved April 10, 2024, from <https://www.vera.org/downloads/pdfdownloads/state-incarceration-trends-south-dakota.pdf>

Cho, R. M., & Tyler, J. H. (2013). Does prison-based adult basic education improve postrelease outcomes for male prisoners in Florida? *Crime & Delinquency*, 59(7), 975–1005.

Costopoulos, J. S., Plewinski, A. M., Monaghan, P. L., & Edkins, V. A. (2017). The impact of US Government assistance on recidivism. *Criminal behaviour and mental health : CBMH*, 27(4), 303–311. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cbm.1997>

Couloute, L. (2018, August). Nowhere to go: Homelessness among formerly incarcerated people.

Prison Policy Initiative. <https://www.prisonpolicy.org/reports/housing.html>

Criminon International. (2024). *Delaware*. [https://www.criminon.org/where-we-work/united-](https://www.criminon.org/where-we-work/united-states/delaware/#:~:text=The%20state%20has%20a%2067.3,some%20point%20after%20their%20release.)

[states/delaware/#:~:text=The%20state%20has%20a%2067.3,some%20point%20after%20their%20release.](https://www.criminon.org/where-we-work/united-states/delaware/#:~:text=The%20state%20has%20a%2067.3,some%20point%20after%20their%20release.)

Criminon International. (2024). *Oregon*. [https://www.criminon.org/where-we-work/united-](https://www.criminon.org/where-we-work/united-20offenders%20are,three%20years%20of%20being%20released.)

[20offenders%20are,three%20years%20of%20being%20released.](https://www.criminon.org/where-we-work/united-20offenders%20are,three%20years%20of%20being%20released.)

Davis, L. M., Bozick, R., Steele, J. L., Saunders, J., & Miles, J. N. V. (2013). Evaluating the effectiveness of correctional education. Washington, DC: RAND Corporation.

Davis, M. (2021, October 8). *The Overrepresentation of Indigenous People in America's Jails:*

What Needs to Change? Safety and Justice Challenge.

<https://safetyandjusticechallenge.org/blog/the-overrepresentation-of-indigenous-people-in-americas-jails-what-needs-to-change/>

Delaware Recidivism Reduction System Blueprint. (2021). Doc.delaware.gov; DCRC - Delaware

Correctional Reentry Commission. <https://doc.delaware.gov/reentry/index.shtml>

Department of Corrections. (2024). Oregon Secretary of State. Oregon Secretary of State Administrative Rules.

<https://secure.sos.state.or.us/oard/displayDivisionRules.action?selectedDivision=913>

Desmarais, S. L., Johnson, K. L., & Singh, J. P. (2016). Performance of recidivism risk

assessment instruments in U.S. correctional settings. *Psychological services, 13*(3), 206–

222. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ser0000075>

Duwe, G., & Clark, V. (2014). The effects of prison-based educational programming on recidivism and employment. *The Prison Journal*, 94(4), 454–478.

Early release options. Oregon Department of Corrections. (2020, May 28).

<https://olis.oregonlegislature.gov/liz/2019I1/Downloads/CommitteeMeetingDocument/222066>

Eichmann, M. (2019). *New funding will improve re-entry help for Delaware inmates*. WHY?.

<https://why.org/articles/new-funding-will-improve-reentry-help-for-delaware-inmates/>

Elderbroom, B., Bieler, S., Peterson, B., & Harvell, S. (2016, May 5). *Assessing the Impact of South Dakota's Sentencing Reforms: Justice Reinvestment Initiative* | Urban Institute.

www.urban.org. <https://www.urban.org/research/publication/assessing-impact-south-dakotas-sentencing-reforms-justice-reinvestment-initiative>

First Step Alliance. (2023, November 26). Rehabilitation lessons from Norway's prison system.

First Step Alliance. <https://www.firststepalliance.org/post/norway-prison-system-lessons>

Fogarty, J., & Giles, M. (2018). Recidivism and education revisited: Evidence for the USA.

Working Paper 1806, Agricultural and Resource Economics, University of Western Australia, Crawley, Australia.

Green, E. (2017, January 11). Oregon's recidivism rate lowest in nation? not so fast. Street

Roots. <https://www.streetroots.org/news/2017/01/05/oregons-recidivism-rate-lowest-nation-not-so-fast>

Guerin, J. (2017). *A perfect storm of failure in criminal justice*. The News Journal.

<https://www.delawareonline.com/story/opinion/contributors/2017/01/03/perfect-storm-failure-criminal-justice/96120826/>

Hall, J., Harger, K. & Stansel, D. Economic Freedom and Recidivism: Evidence from US States.

Int Adv Econ Res 21, 155–165 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11294-015-9520-5>

Harvell, S., Courtney, L., & Thomson, C. (2019). JUSTICE REINVESTMENT INITIATIVE (JRI). In Bureau of Justice Assistance, *URBAN INSTITUTE* [Report].

https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/2020/03/06/justice_reinvestment_initiative_jri_south_dakota.pdf

Harwin, A. (2012). Title VII Challenges to Employment Discrimination Against Minority Men with Criminal Records. *The Berkeley Journal of African-American Law & Policy*, 14(1), 6. <https://doi.org/10.15779/z38ww4h>

Hatzenbuehler, M. L., Phelan, J. C., & Link, B. G. (2013). Stigma as a fundamental cause of population health inequalities. *American journal of public health*, 103(5), 813–821.

<https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2012.301069>

Hayden, M. (2023). *Recidivism Rates in the United States versus Europe: How and Recidivism*

Rates in the United States versus Europe: How and Why are they Different? Why are they Different?

https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=4677&context=honors_theses

Ijaz, S. (2023, June 9). *Japan's "Hostage justice" system*. Human Rights Watch.

<https://www.hrw.org/report/2023/05/25/japans-hostage-justice-system/denial-bail-coerced->

[confessions-and-lack-access#:~:text=Japan%20has%20a%2099.8%20percent,or%20not%20has%20enormous%20significance.](#)

Ijun, L., Stein, J., Geckeler, C., & Pasternack, E. (2022, September). Reentry projects grant evaluation. U.S. Department of Labor.

<https://www.dol.gov/agencies/oasp/evaluation/completedstudies/Reentry-Projects-Grant-Evaluation>

Japan Ministry of Justice Rehabilitation Bureau. (2023). *Offender Rehabilitation in Japan: Walk along with local communities*. <https://www.moj.go.jp/content/001345372.pdf>

Kambayashi, T. (2023, May 5). Presumed guilt? unpacking Japan's 99.9% conviction rate. The Christian Science Monitor. <https://www.csmonitor.com/World/Asia-Pacific/2023/0505/Presumed-guilt-Unpacking-Japan-s-99.9-conviction-rate>

Kase, T. (2023). Construct Validity of the 29-Item Sense of Coherence Scale: Exploratory Analysis of a Compatible Three-Factor Model Using a Rasch Measurement Model. *Japanese Psychological Research*, 65(1), 48–56. [https://doi-org.usd.idm.oclc.org/10.1111/jpr.12348](https://doi.org.usd.idm.oclc.org/10.1111/jpr.12348)

Keene, D. E., Smoyer, A. B., & Blankenship, K. M. (2018). Stigma, housing and identity after prison. *The Sociological review*, 66(4), 799–815. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038026118777447>

King, R., & Elderbroom, B. (2014, October). Improving recidivism as a performance measure.

Urban Institute. <https://bja.ojp.gov/sites/g/files/xyckuh186/files/media/document/UI-ImprovingRecidivism.pdf>

Kirby, E. J. (2019, July 6). How Norway turns criminals into good neighbours. BBC News.

<https://www.bbc.com/news/stories-48885846>

Kishi, K., Suzuki, J., Monma, T., Asanuma, T., & Takeda, F. (2018). Psychosocial and criminological factors related to recidivism among Japanese criminals at offender rehabilitation facilities. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 4(1), 1489458.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2018.1489458>

Labutta, E. (2017). The prisoner as one of us: Norwegian wisdom for American Penal Practice.

Emory Law Scholarly Commons.

<https://scholarlycommons.law.emory.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1177&context=eilr>

Magee, G. (2021, February 10). Education reduces recidivism. *Technium Social Sciences*

Journal. <https://doi.org/10.47577/tssj.v16i1.2668>

Matei, A. (2022, August 16). *Solitary Confinement in US Prisons* | Urban Institute.

[Www.urban.org](https://www.urban.org); Urban Institute. <https://www.urban.org/research/publication/solitary-confinement-us-prisons>

McAlister, S. M., Kerodal, A. K., Officer, K. O., & Sanchagrin, K. S. (2022, November). *Oregon Recidivism Analysis*. Oregon Criminal Justice Commission. Retrieved April 8, 2024, from

<https://www.oregon.gov/cjc/CJC%20Document%20Library/Recidivism%20Report%20November%202022.pdf>

- McBride, R. (2023, October 4). *Racial disparities persist in Alaska's prisons*. Alaska Public Media. <https://alaskapublic.org/2023/10/04/racial-disparities-among-alaska-native-and-american-indian-inmates-a-troubling-picture/#:~:text=It%20looked%20at%20every%20state>
- Miller, B. L., & Agnich, L. E. (2016). Unpaid debt to society: exploring how ex-felons view restrictions on voting rights after the completion of their sentence. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 19(1), 69–85. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10282580.2015.1101685>
- Miller, B. L., Ellonen, N., Boman, J. H., 4th, Dorn, S., Suonpää, K., Aaltonen, O. P., & Oksanen, A. (2022). Examining Sanction Type and Drug Offender Recidivism: A Register-Based Study in Finland. *American journal of criminal justice : AJCJ*, 47(5), 836–854. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-020-09592-8>
- Moore, K. E., Stuewig, J. B., & Tangney, J. P. (2015). The Effect of Stigma on Criminal Offenders' Functioning: A Longitudinal Mediation Model. *Deviant Behavior*, 37(2), 196–218. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01639625.2014.1004035>
- Moran, D., & Keinänen, A. (2012). The “inside” and “outside” of prisons: Carceral geography and home visits for prisoners in Finland. *Fennia*, 190(2), 62–76. <https://doi-org.usd.idm.oclc.org/10.11143/4895>
- Moreno, R. (2014, August 13). *South Dakota addresses the post-release needs of Native Americans*. Vera Institute of Justice. <https://www.vera.org/news/south-dakota-addresses-the-post-release-needs-of-native-americans>

Nagy, B. (2014, September 11). Bastøy prison: Creating good neighbors. Pulitzer Center.

<https://pulitzercenter.org/stories/bastoy-prison-creating-good-neighbors>

Narag, R. E., & Jones, C. R. (2017). Understanding Prison Management in the Philippines: A Case for Shared Governance. *The Prison Journal*, 97(1), 3-26.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885516679366>

Nario-Lopez, H. (2020). The potential and plausibility of Rehabilitative Prison Culture: A Philippine example. *Social Science Diliman*, 16(2), 29–65

National Conference of State Legislators. (2023, March 7). *Felon Voting Rights*. www.ncsl.org;

National Conference of State Legislators. [https://www.ncsl.org/elections-and-](https://www.ncsl.org/elections-and-campaigns/felon-voting-rights)

[campaigns/felon-voting-rights](https://www.ncsl.org/elections-and-campaigns/felon-voting-rights)

[ovember%202022.pdf](https://www.ncsl.org/elections-and-campaigns/felon-voting-rights)

O’Hear, M. M. (2015). Let the Good Time Roll: Early Release for Good Behavior in Prison.

Marquette University Law School.

Pelletier, E., & Evans, D. (2019). Beyond Recidivism: Positive Outcomes from Higher

Education Programs in Prisons. *Journal of Correctional Education* (1974-), 70(2), 49–68.

<https://www.jstor.org/stable/26864182>

Petre, A., & Tomiță, M. (2022). EDUCATION IN PRISONS – AN ESSENTIAL FACTOR IN PREVENTING RECIDIVISM. THE ROLE OF DETENTION OFFICERS IN THE EDUCATIONAL PROCESS. *Journal of Community Positive Practices*, 22(2), 99-106.

<https://doi.org/10.35782/JCPP.2022.2.07>

Pfankuch, B. (2023, July 11). *New, low-cost jail education program debuts in South Dakota*.

Rapid City Journal. https://rapidcityjournal.com/news/local/new-low-cost-jail-education-program-debuts-in-south-dakota/article_d062bd88-1f45-11ee-9a38-9f8582ad18f9.html

Pompoco, A., Wooldredge, J., Lugo, M., Sullivan, C., & Latessa, E. J. (2017). Reducing inmate misconduct and prison returns with facility education programs. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 16(2), 515–547.

Prison and Probation Service of Finland. (2023). Prisons. Rikosseuraamuslaitos.

<https://www.rikosseuraamus.fi/en/index/units/prisons.html#:~:text=Prisoners%20serve%20their%20sentence%20either,are%20placed%20in%20open%20institutions.>

Ray, R., & Madison, A. (2023). Reducing criminal recidivism in Alaska: The Set Free Model:

This article is related directly to the First European Conference on Law Enforcement and Public Health (LEPH) held in Umea, Sweden in May 2023. *Journal of Community Safety and Well-Being*, 8(3), 119–124. <https://doi.org/10.35502/jcswb.331>

RECIDIVISM IN DELAWARE: An Analysis of Prisoners Released in 2008 and 2009. (2013,

July). Delaware Criminal Justice Council Statistical Analysis Center.

<https://static.prisonpolicy.org/scans/RecidivismFinalJuly30.pdf>

Reyes, J. M. (2015). *ACLU, CLASI sue Delaware prisons*. Delaware Online.

<https://www.delawareonline.com/story/news/local/2015/08/07/aclu-clasi-sue-prison-treatment-mentally-inmates/31209355/>

Reyes, J. M. (2016). *Calls to rethink Delaware's solitary confinement*. Delaware Online.

<https://www.delawareonline.com/story/news/local/2016/05/13/calls-rethink-delawares-solitary-confinement/83871592/>

Riley, K. (2017). Why There's a Revolving Prison Door. Www.mackinac.org.

<https://www.mackinac.org/why-theres-a-revolving-prison-door>

Salt, J. (2023). *RECIDIVISM IN DELAWARE Prepared by the Statistical Analysis Center*

Delaware Criminal Justice Council. Delaware Criminal Justice Council.

<https://sac.delaware.gov/wp-content/uploads/sites/64/2023/12/2019-Recidivism-Report-final-122223.pdf>

Sandbukt, I. J. (2023). Reentry in Practice: Sexual Offending, Self-Narratives, and the Implications of Stigma in Norway. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 67(9), 930-951. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X211049184>

Short-term transitional leave. Department of Corrections : Short-Term Transitional Leave : Community Corrections : State of Oregon. (n.d.).

<https://www.oregon.gov/doc/community-corrections/pages/short-term-transitional-leave.aspx>

Slater, J., Winder, B., O'Grady, A., & Banyard, P. (2023). 'There is nothing for me': A qualitative analysis of the views towards prison education of adult male prisoners convicted of a sexual offence. *The Howard Journal of Crime and Justice*, 62(3), 391–407.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/hojo.12521>

Texas Reduced Crime, Incarceration, and Recidivism Rates in Partnership with Private Organizations. (2020). <https://www.mtc trains.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/Texas-MTC-Partnership.pdf>

The Philippines addresses jails and prisons overcrowding. (2023). United Nations : UNODC Regional Office for Southeast Asia and the Pacific.

<https://www.unodc.org/roseap/en/philippines/2023/12/jails-prisons-overcrowding/story.html#:~:text=The%20Philippines%20has%20the%20eleventh>

Tomlinson, K. D. (2016, December). An examination of deterrence theory: Where do we stand?.

United States Courts. <https://www.uscourts.gov/federal-probation-journal/2016/12/examination-deterrence-theory-where-do-we-stand>

Tsui, A. (2017, April 18). *Does Solitary Confinement Make Inmates More Likely To Reoffend?*

FRONTLINE; Frontline PBS. <https://www.pbs.org/wgbh/frontline/article/does-solitary-confinement-make-inmates-more-likely-to-reoffend/>

Valenzuela, R. P. V. (2016, December 1). *Glimmers of hope: A report on the Philippine Criminal*

Justice System. International Review of the Red Cross. <https://international-review.icrc.org/articles/glimmers-hope-report-philippine-criminal-justice-system>

Valle, A. (2017, October 2). *Alaska Results First Initiative: Adult Criminal Justice Program*

Benefit Cost Analysis. Scholarworks.alaska.edu; Alaska Justice Information Center, University of Alaska Anchorage. <https://scholarworks.alaska.edu/handle/11122/7961>

Valle, A. (2018). Expanded View of Recidivism in Alaska. *Alaska Justice Forum*, 34(3).

<http://hdl.handle.net/11122/8091>

- Villman, E. (2023). Narratives of normality: Finnish prisoners envisioning their future. *Punishment & Society*, 25(1), 80-98. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14624745211007192>
- Walton, E. (2024, January 19). *Senate committee rejects bill offering inmate rehab initiatives*. SDPB. <https://listen.sdpb.org/politics/2024-01-19/senate-committee-rejects-bill-offering-inmate-rehab-initiatives>
- Weiman, D. F. (2007). Barriers to Prisoners' Reentry into the Labor Market and the Social Costs of Recidivism. *Social Research*, 74(2), 575–611.
- Westrope, E. (2018). Employment Discrimination on the Basis of Criminal History: Why an Anti-Discrimination Statute Is a Necessary Remedy. *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology*, 108(2), 367–397.
- Williams, T. (2023, October 20). *Shortage of correctional officers forces Alaska jail to close for weeks*. Corrections1; Anchorage Daily News, Alaska. <https://www.corrections1.com/prison-staffing/articles/shortage-of-correctional-officers-forces-alaska-jail-to-close-for-weeks-rm7BFFwM7EtpD6kz/>
- World Population Review. (2023, May). *Recidivism Rates by State 2020*. Worldpopulationreview.com. <https://worldpopulationreview.com/state-rankings/recidivism-rates-by-state>
- Yukhnenko, D., Sridhar, S., & Fazel, S. (2020). A systematic review of criminal recidivism rates worldwide: 3-year update. *Wellcome open research*, 4, 28. <https://doi.org/10.12688/wellcomeopenres.14970.3>