

**Life on Parole: The Quality of Experiences Soon After Release Contributes to a  
Conviction-free Re-entry**

Jessie L. Gwynne, Julia A. Yesberg, & Devon L. L. Polaschek

Victoria University of Wellington

**Abstract**

**Background:** People returning to the community after prison face many challenges, including finding suitable accommodation and employment, and accessing good social support. The prospects are particularly poor for high-risk offenders with up to a third of those released in New Zealand returning to prison within 100 days.

**Aims/hypotheses:** We developed the Parole Experiences Measure (PEM) to quantify the quality of men's life experiences during the first weeks of re-entry from prison. We aimed to answer the question, can the quality of life experiences differentiate men who survive in the community without reconviction from those who do not?

**Methods:** Using a longitudinal design, we examined whether PEM scores for 178 men with extensive histories of crime and violence predicted three recidivism indices (breach of parole, reconviction and reimprisonment) over a 12-month follow-up period.

**Results:** We found that PEM scores predicted all three indices of recidivism. Of the two PEM subscales, external circumstances (finances, support, accommodation) were more predictive of recidivism than subjective wellbeing (mental and physical health).

**Conclusions/implications:** The results suggest that meeting basic practical needs in the early months of parole may be more important to avoiding reconviction than attending only to mental and physical health.

**Keywords:** accommodation, high-risk prisoner, parole, parole survival, recidivism prediction, re-entry, reintegration, resettlement, wellbeing

## **Introduction**

Rates of reconviction in released prisoners are often judged to be unacceptably high (Hosier, 2020; Taylor, 2019). But for many prisoners, release means finding a place to live, securing work, re-establishing relationships with family and friends and accessing support in the community (Figgatt, 2020). For people considered to be at high risk of reoffending, this task is even more complex, owing to the characteristics (e.g., impulsivity, poor emotional control and problem-solving skills, strong bonds to criminal peers) that leave them poorly equipped to tackle life's obstacles. As many as 60% of New Zealand's high-risk offenders return to prison within the first 100 days of release (Nadesu, 2007), suggesting these early weeks are particularly important for understanding factors associated with successful desistance or failure on parole. This research examines the extent to which people's experiences in the first weeks after release are related to subsequent recidivism-free survival in the community

## **Desistance Theory and the Re-entry Period**

Desistance theorists point to a number of types of desistance. Maruna and Farrell (2004) proposed primary desistance, defined as any lull or gap in criminal behaviour; and secondary desistance, defined as a long-term absence of offending where the ex-offender develops a new sense of identity as a 'changed person'. More recently, McNeill has added another long term phase—tertiary desistance—to refer to shifts in the recognition by others of personal change, and sense of belonging (McNeill, 2015). But successful re-entry is a necessary step before long-term desistance can be achieved (Göbbels, Ward, & Willis, 2012) and the re-entry period is a complex and challenging time. During re-entry, people move from a very structured environment to one that can be chaotic and unpredictable (Visher & Travis, 2003). The reality of having to feed oneself, pay bills, and seek formal assistance can be extremely difficult for released offenders, who may find themselves 'just exhausted trying to live

outside' (Opie, 2012, p. 139). The cumulative impact of these challenges, sometimes in combination with complex parole license requirements, may make it difficult for individuals to resume an ordinary life and achieve successful reintegration into the community (Graffam, Shinkfield, Lavelle, & McPherson, 2004; Nugent & Schinkel, 2016).

Models of desistance point to at least two sources of desistance success. Historically, social structural models emphasised the importance of external factors (e.g., marriage, secure employment) in moving away from crime (Laub & Sampson, 2003; Sampson & Laub, 2005). By contrast, cognitive or subjective models instead regard internal factors, such as a developing non-criminal identity or commitment to desistance, as more important (e.g., Giordano, 2014). Consistent with desistance theory, factors that predict the likelihood an individual will achieve successful re-entry (e.g., Bahr, Harris, Fisher, & Harker Armstrong, 2010; LeBel, Burnett, Maruna, & Bushway, 2008; Shinkfield & Graffam, 2009) can be conceptualised as either facilitators or barriers (Göbbels, Willis, & Ward, 2014). Some are subjective or internal to the individual (e.g., beliefs about crime, mental health), while others are external (e.g., accommodation and employment; Serin & Lloyd, 2009). Individuals who go on to be reconvicted face more challenges than those who do not (Zamble & Quinsey, 1997). The current study was influenced by both Giordano, Cernkovich, and Rudolph (2002) and LeBel et al.'s (2008) research, which suggest that both internal and external factors are important.

## **Facilitators and Barriers to Re-entry**

### *External Circumstances*

Examples of external facilitators to re-entry include finding safe and stable accommodation (Baldry, McDonnell, Maplestone, & Peeters, 2006; Bucklen & Zajac, 2009; Metraux & Culhane, 2004) and obtaining employment after release (Bahr et al., 2010;

Solomon, Visher, La Vigne, & Osborne, 2006; Visher, Debus, & Yahner, 2008). In one study, the higher the wage earned by individuals, the lower the likelihood they would be reimprisoned 12 months after release (Visher et al., 2008). The importance of social support—for many ex-prisoners, family support—to re-entry success has been relatively less investigated (Bucklen & Zajac, 2009; La Vigne, Visher, & Castro, 2004). But research shows the quality of family support, rather than just its presence, is important. Individuals with negative or criminal family relationships, or who report problems or stresses in their relationships, are less likely to achieve re-entry success (Bahr et al., 2010; La Vigne et al., 2004). A stable and supportive intimate relationship is also important. Those who achieve success on parole are significantly more likely to live with a spouse or significant other than those who violate parole (e.g., 34% vs. 22%; Bucklen & Zajac, 2009). Besides basic survival needs and social support, access to drugs and alcohol and connections to criminal peers are well established obstacles to re-entry success (Bonta & Andrews, 2016; Bucklen & Zajac, 2009; Zamble & Quinsey, 1997). Contact with criminal peers increases access to opportunities for offending, influences criminal thinking and may undermine desistance commitment (Serin & Lloyd, 2009). Those who engage in substance use after release from prison are more likely to be rearrested (La Vigne et al., 2004; Solomon et al., 2006). Criminal peers can facilitate access to substances, and resuming use creates other problems; heavy alcohol use for instance has been associated with difficulties in employment, finances, and interpersonal relationships (Shinkfield & Graffam, 2009).

### ***Internal State***

Factors such as commitment to desistance and motivation to avoid offending are important to re-entry success (Polaschek & Yesberg, 2015). But although intuitively appealing, the link between internal states such as mental and physical wellbeing and success on parole has received little attention, and it is these types of internal states that we focus on

here. Persistent offending is linked to poorer mental and physical wellbeing (Odgers et al., 2008; Reising, Ttofi, Farrington, & Piquero, 2019). However, it is unclear whether such links result from common early developmental pathways, or suggest contemporary causality (Reising et al., 2019). A recently proposed public health approach to desistance argues for the importance of promoting mental and physical health for successful re-entry (Link, Ward, & Stansfield, 2019). Using data from the SVORI project, Link et al make a compelling case for the indirect influence of physical and mental health on reincarceration through their associations with later difficulties in employment, family conflict and financial problems.

The Link et al. study is methodologically sophisticated, but much of the research on factors relevant to re-entry success is hampered by methodological limitations, including: the use of cross-sectional study designs (e.g., Bucklen & Zajac, 2009); failure to control for possible confounding variables (e.g., Bahr et al., 2010; Baldry et al., 2006; Bucklen & Zajac, 2009); and a reliance on self-report data (e.g., Visher et al., 2008). This study seeks to overcome some limitations. First, we construct a reliable measure of re-entry experiences incorporating both parolee and probation officer interview data on the parolee's parole circumstances and experiences. Second, using a longitudinal study design, and controlling for a number of possible confounds, we investigate whether these experiences during re-entry predict recidivism. By using this methodology, the present research allows for a more methodologically rigorous examination of the relationship between parolees' experiences after release from prison and recidivism.

## **Method**

### **The Parole Project**

The data for this research were taken from the New Zealand Parole Project: a longitudinal study of 300 high-risk violent male prisoners recruited just prior to parole. The men were

either (a) programme completers from one of four High-Risk Special Treatment Unit (HRSTU; the *treatment* sample), or (b) similarly high-risk prisoners who had not completed a HRSTU programme (the *comparison* sample). Eligible men were over 20 years of age, at high static risk of reimprisonment for new offences ( $\text{RoC}^*\text{RoI} > .65$ )<sup>1</sup>, sentenced to at least two years imprisonment<sup>2</sup>, and released from prison onto parole between November 2010 and November 2013. Men who consented to participate were interviewed 2 and 6 months following release. Their probation officers were independently interviewed 2 and 6 months after the men were released (see Polaschek et al., 2016 for more detail).

### Study Sample

The final sample for this study consisted of 178 men: 92 participants who completed treatment at a HRSTU, and 86 comparison sample participants.<sup>3</sup> Most self-identified as New Zealand Māori (61.2%), 32.6% as European/European New Zealander, 5.1% as Pasefika, and 1.1% as other. Ages ranged from 19 to 60 at release ( $M=32.92$ ,  $SD=8.78$ ); mean age at first conviction was 16 years ( $SD=1.98$ ), and mean likelihood of returning to prison within the 5 years following release was 74% (mean  $\text{RoC}^*\text{RoI}=.74$ ,  $SD=.12$ ). The mean score on the Violence Risk Scale (VRS)—which estimates risk of future violence convictions using both

---

<sup>1</sup> The  $\text{RoC}^*\text{RoI}$  (Bakker et al., 1999) is an actuarial static risk-factor based assessment tool.  $\text{RoC}^*\text{RoI}$  scores are computer-generated, based on demographic and offence history characteristics, and represent the probability that an individual will be reconvicted resulting in reimprisonment over a five-year period in the community (e.g.,  $\text{RoC}^*\text{RoI}$  of .65 indicates a 65% likelihood of returning to prison for a new conviction within five years).

<sup>2</sup> In New Zealand, all people serving sentences of 2 or more years' imprisonment are eligible for release as early as one- third of the way into their sentence. If they are released prior to sentence end-date they are on parole for the length of the sentence that remained, and an additional six months. If released at the end of their sentence, their period of correctional oversight is still six months. The term 'parole' is used here to refer to both types of release; both require regular reporting to community probation staff and the fulfilment of a number of release conditions.

<sup>3</sup> One hundred and thirty-three cases were excluded due to missing data (119 were missing interview data from the parolee).

static and dynamic factors — was 52 ( $SD=8.43$ ): in the high risk band (Wong & Gordon, 2006).<sup>4</sup> The most serious index offence for the majority was violent (62.9%; including 9% for sexual violation); 35.4% committed a non-violent index offence (e.g., property and drug-related offences), and 1.7% were convicted of minor justice/administrative offences (e.g., failure to report on bail). Participants had an average of 73 previous convictions ( $SD=55.50$ ) and 5 previous violent convictions ( $SD=4.54$ ).

Twelve men were on indefinite sentences; the remaining 166 served actual sentence lengths ranging from 256 days to 5569 days ( $M=1559$  days,  $SD=1080$ ). Approximately 60% were granted parole prior to sentence end; the remaining 40% were released at the end of their sentence. The minimum parole period was 6 months, and the average<sup>5</sup> was 354 days ( $SD=254.39$ ).

## **Procedure**

### ***Data Collection***

Participants were recruited in prison by the Parole Project research team. Approximately two months after each man was released, a member of the research team contacted his probation officer, and the parolee himself. Two months was judged to be the post-release interval that optimally balanced the competing issues of (a) giving the parolee enough time to begin to settle into community life, and develop a relationship with the probation officer, and (b) with a sample at very high risk of reoffending, the importance of collecting re-entry data before a new offence. We sought consent from each participant — parolee or probation

---

<sup>4</sup> The VRS (Wong & Gordon, 2006) is a 26-item staff-rated instrument comprising 6 static (e.g., age at first offence) and 20 dynamic (e.g., criminal attitudes) risk factors. The sum of the static and dynamic items represents an individual's level of risk for reconvictions for violence.

<sup>5</sup> Excludes those on indefinite sentences; they were also on life parole.

officer—to complete a confidential telephone interview of about 40 min with a research team member. The interview included questions about the parolee's post-release experiences. Interviews were structured and included a mix of Likert-type ratings and free responses. Similar content was covered with both parolees and staff, with the exception of ratings of parolees' internal states (see below), which were collected only from parolees

### ***Development of the Parole Experiences Measure***

The Parole Experiences Measure (PEM) was developed for the current study to measure both the internal state of the parolee and the external circumstances of his life on parole. Below we describe how the PEM was developed; its psychometric properties are described in the Results.

**External Circumstances.** Nine sections in the 2-month interview schedule captured parolees' life circumstances: accommodation, personal support, community support, employment, finances, antisocial associates, alcohol use, drug use and thoughts about committing crimes. Because these areas were assessed using multiple questions, the first author and another member of the research team constructed a comprehensive coding scheme for integrating and scoring the information in each area. The criteria for coding drew on relevant re-entry literature and all 9 items were coded on a 1 to 4 Likert scale with higher scores indicating higher quality. Parolees' responses were supplemented using information gathered in the corresponding probation officer interview. The coding scheme provided instructions on how to manage discrepancies between parolee and probation officer responses, if they arose.

**Inter-Rater Reliability.** To establish inter-rater reliability for the external circumstances items, the first author and an independent rater coded a randomly selected sample of 40 interviews (20.7% of the total sample). Because the *degree* of rating discordance is important

with ordinal scales such as those constructed here, linear weighted kappa coefficients were calculated using the VassarStats website (Lowry, 2015). The resulting kappa values for individual items ranged from 0.82 to 1, indicating an almost perfect level of agreement between the two raters on all items (Landis & Koch, 1977). Having established adequate inter-rater reliability, the remaining interview protocols were coded by only one rater.

**Internal State.** The PEM also included six items taken directly from the 2 month follow-up interview for parolees, reflecting each parolee's current internal state: mental health, physical health, negative emotions, positive emotions, and how he was feeling overall on the day of the interview, and over the last month. Four of the items—mental health, physical health, feeling today and feeling over the last month—were rated by parolees on a six-point Likert scale during their interview, with higher scores indicating better experiences. The remaining two items, positive and negative emotions, were developed through calculating the sum of parolees' ratings of how often in the previous two weeks they had experienced a list of positive and negative emotions, ranging from 1 (not at all) to 3 (a lot) and these ratings were summed to give a positive emotions and negative emotions score. Following these calculations, the negative emotions item was reverse coded.<sup>6</sup>

### ***Recidivism***

Three dichotomous indices of recidivism for the 12 months following release from prison were used: any breach of parole conditions, any new conviction (i.e., excluding breaches of parole), and any conviction leading to imprisonment. New convictions for violence were excluded due to low prevalence. Recidivism data were extracted from the national conviction

---

<sup>6</sup> We did not calculate inter-rater reliability for internal states because these ratings were made by parolees during the 2-month interview.

history database.

## **Results**

The results are presented in two parts. First, we report the psychometric properties for the PEM; and second, we investigate the relationships between the PEM and the three recidivism outcomes. All analyses were conducted using IBM SPSS Statistics version 22.

### **Psychometric Analysis of the PEM**

#### *Principal Components Analysis*

To investigate the factor structure of the PEM, a principal components analysis (PCA) was conducted. PCA was chosen over confirmatory factor analysis because we did not have a specific hypothesis about the underlying factor structure. Prior to performing the PCA, data were assessed statistically and found suitable for factor analysis. Because of sample size and communality criteria, the scree plot was used to determine the number of components to extract: there was a clear break after the second component, suggesting that two factors be retained (Field, 2005).

To aid in the interpretation of the two factors, we performed orthogonal rotation using the oblimin method. The rotated solution revealed the presence of a number of strong loadings (above 0.4) on both components. Only factor loadings with a value greater than 0.4 were interpreted (Stevens, 1992), leading to the removal of two items (employment and community support) that did not load substantially on either of the components, probably because most participants obtained low scores on both items. A third item (thoughts about crime) loaded on both components and was also excluded.

The final two-factor solution explained 46.15% of the variance, with component 1 contributing 31.77% and component 2 contributing 14.38%. In the rotated solution, the

eigenvalues for the two components were 3.21 and 2.32, respectively. The loadings for each component are presented in Table 1. Component 1, labelled subjective wellbeing, consisted of six items pertaining to parolees' perceptions of their physical, mental, and emotional wellbeing. Component 2, labelled external circumstances, consisted of six items that relate to parolees' circumstances after release from prison. The correlation between the two subscales was 0.35

[Insert Table 1 about here]

### ***Internal Reliability***

Based on Cronbach's alpha, the subjective wellbeing subscale of the PEM demonstrated adequate internal reliability ( $\alpha=.82$ ), as did the external circumstances subscale ( $\alpha=.66$ ), given that fewer subscale items automatically yield lower Cronbach's alpha values (Pallant, 2010). The Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the total PEM was .79, indicating overall acceptable internal reliability.

### ***Computing Mean Item and Subscale Scores***

Because raw PEM item scores used several different metrics, they were first standardised before calculating mean total PEM scores and mean subscale scores; it is these scores that are used in all subsequent analyses. However, standardised scores are difficult to interpret qualitatively, so to facilitate description and visual comparison of parole experiences, all PEM items were also recalculated to fit on a scale from 0 to 1. Descriptive statistics for each item and subscale totals calculated this way are presented in Table 2.

[Insert Table 2 about here]

### **Examining Relationships Between the PEM and Recidivism**

In the first 12 months after release from prison, 67 (37.6%) of the 178 men were convicted of breaching their parole conditions, 97 (54.5%) were convicted of a new criminal offence, and 62 (34.8%) were convicted of a criminal offence resulting in reimprisonment. Men were excluded from analysis if they were convicted of an offence before the date of their two-month interview.<sup>7</sup> We investigated whether parole experiences—total PEM scores, and external circumstances and subjective wellbeing subscale scores—were predictive of each of these three types of reconviction, using binary logistic regression models. In each regression, we controlled for a number of potential covariates (see Note for Table 3).

### ***Breach of Parole Conditions***

As shown in Table 3, controlling for relevant covariates, the total PEM score significantly predicted breaches of parole conditions, demonstrating that higher PEM scores were associated with a reduced likelihood of a breach; for. The odds ratio was .49, indicating that for every additional point in PEM score, respondents were 51% less likely to be convicted of a breach of parole conditions in the first year after release from prison. Table 3 also shows the relative contribution of the external circumstances and subjective wellbeing subscales to the prediction of breaches; neither significantly independently predicted breaches of parole conditions.

[Insert Table 3 about here]

### ***Reconviction (Excluding Breaches of Parole)***

The total PEM score also significantly predicted reconviction (see Table 3). The relationship between PEM scores and reconviction was in the expected negative direction.

---

<sup>7</sup> For breach of parole conditions, 23 men were excluded; for reconviction (excluding breaches), 28 men were excluded, and for reconviction leading to reimprisonment, 22 men were excluded.

For every additional point in PEM score, men were 53% less likely to be reconvicted of a new offence in their first year in the community. Only the external circumstances subscale made a unique statistically significant contribution to the model: higher external circumstances scores were associated with a decreased likelihood of reconviction.

### ***Reimprisonment***

Lastly, as shown in Table 3, the total PEM score significantly predicted reimprisonment; higher scores were associated with a decreased likelihood of reimprisonment. For every additional point in PEM score, participants were 56% less likely to return to prison. Neither subscale made a statistically significant unique contribution to predicting reimprisonment at the  $p < .05$  level.

## **Discussion**

Across all recidivism indices, better experiences of parole (i.e., higher PEM scores) significantly predicted lower odds of recidivism. These findings support previous research on the importance of the re-entry period in predicting recidivism outcomes (e.g., Baldry et al., 2006; Bucklen & Zajac, 2009; La Vigne et al., 2004; Visher et al., 2008). They also support the argument that lifestyle factors in the first few weeks after release among people at high risk of reconviction are indicative of recidivism outcomes months later.

One possible explanation is that men who had better experiences on parole were better equipped to successfully progress through the desistance process. For example, the integrated theory of desistance from sexual offending (Göbbels et al., 2012) sees re-entry as a crucial component of the process of leaving crime behind. Göbbels et al. (2014) argue that successful re-entry promotes longer-term desistance, whereas a stressful and problematic re-entry experience increases the likelihood of recidivism, possibly because lack of social and material resources undermines the initial commitment (Burnett, 1992; Davis, Bahr, & Ward,

2013). Those individuals who, in the first few months have better experiences both with the outside world and internally, are better equipped to progress through later stages of desistance (Polaschek, 2019). And both the PCA and regression analyses of the PEM demonstrated that these two types of factors—external circumstances (e.g., accommodation, personal support) and the internal state or subjective wellbeing—are distinctly different from each other. These findings support previous theory and research into specific sources of barriers and facilitators to re-entry (e.g., Giordano, 2014; Göbbels et al., 2012; LeBel et al., 2008; Sampson & Laub, 2005; Yesberg & Polaschek, 2015). We found that better scores on each type contributed to the likelihood of completing the first year in the community without convictions.

But when examined together, only the external circumstances subscale significantly (uniquely) predicted any recidivism outcome (reconviction at the  $p < 0.05$  level and reimprisonment at the  $p < 0.10$  level). These findings provide tentative support for the importance of parolees' external life circumstances, such as where they live and who they lean on for support, in predicting recidivism over and above mental and physical wellbeing. Consistent with Maslow's (1943) theory of human motivation, an individual's subjective wellbeing may be dependent on satisfying these lower-level needs, such as food and shelter. Of course, another possible explanation for the lack of unique predictive validity of the subjective wellbeing subscale relates to the narrow range of factors measured (mental and physical health and emotional wellbeing). Previous research has captured a wider array of internal factors, including commitment to desistance, hope, and identity (Burnett & Maruna, 2004; Maruna, 2001; Polaschek & Yesberg, 2015), and has found positive associations between these factors and recidivism.

This research addresses some limitations of prior studies by using a longitudinal design, controlling for important potential confounds, and constructing a reliable rating scale based

on information from both parolees and their probation officers. However, there are still important limitations. First, the sample only included men with complete 2-month interview data. Those who were not able to be contacted may have had poorer re-entry experiences, potentially resulting in less variance in PEM scores. Selective attrition may account for the relatively poor level of fit in these models (see pseudo-R<sup>2</sup> statistics in Table 3).

Second, this research design cannot determine how some parolees came to have better experiences than others. Do some men simply have families who are better resourced than others, and better release plans? Nor do we know how better experiences on parole lead to reductions in recidivism: for example, do better experiences in the early weeks translate into an improved lifestyle in the intermediate term? Drawing on the work of Göbbels et al. (2012, 2014), future research could explore whether subjective factors, such as commitment to desistance and the adoption of a non-offender identity, may be the mechanism through which better experiences on parole lead to reductions in recidivism. Taking account of more recent theorising regarding desistance, the inclusion of specific measures of social identity development would also be a valuable addition (Nugent & Schinkel, 2016; Roque, Posick, & Paternoster, 2016). Research on mechanisms is essential to determining the types of interventions that may be effective in supporting more vulnerable parolees to achieve better life experiences during re-entry.

Lastly, the present research used a narrow definition of re-entry success: an absence of reconviction after 12 months in the community. Although a necessary precondition, the absence of a new conviction within the first year of release may not mean that an individual is progressing towards long-term desistance (Polaschek, 2019). Recent research has cast some doubt on the extent to which parolees actually can 'make good' (Maruna, 2001), and most notably, on whether early re-entry indicators actually do lead to positive long-term outcomes (Giordano, Schroeder, & Cernkovich, 2007; Nugent & Schinkel, 2016). Future

research could explore how individuals' experiences during re-entry are associated both with changes in different types of desistance (e.g., Nugent & Schinkel, 2016) and long-term abstinence from crime. In the meantime, ensuring people released from prison are equipped with the mental, physical, social and material resources they need to tackle the many challenges they will face during re-entry has the potential to reduce the significant financial and social costs associated with crime, increase public safety, and improve the quality of life of newly released parolees.

## References

- Bahr, S. J., Harris, L., Fisher, J. K., & Harker Armstrong, A. (2010). Successful reentry: What differentiates successful and unsuccessful parolees? *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, *54*(5), 667–692.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X09342435>
- Bakker, L., Riley, D., & O'Malley, J. (1999). *Risk of reconviction: Statistical models predicting four types of reoffending*. Department of Corrections Psychological Services.
- Baldry, E., McDonnell, D., Maplestone, P., & Peeters, M. (2006). Ex-prisoners, homelessness and the state in Australia. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, *39*(1), 20–33. <https://doi.org/10.1375/acri.39.1.20>
- Bonta, J., & Andrews, D. A. (2016). *The psychology of criminal conduct* (6th ed.). Routledge.
- Bucklen, K. B., & Zajac, G. (2009). But some of them don't come back (to prison!). *The Prison Journal*, *89*(3), 239–264. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885509339504>
- Burnett, R. (1992). *The dynamics of recidivism*. University of Oxford Centre for Criminological Research.
- Burnett, R., & Maruna, S. (2004). So “prison works”, does it? The criminal careers of 130 men released from prison under home secretary, Michael Howard. *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, *43*, 390–404. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2311.2004.00337.x>
- Davis, C., Bahr, S. J., & Ward, C. (2013). The process of offender reintegration: Perceptions of what helps prisoners reenter society. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, *13*(4), 446–469. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1748895812454748>
- Field, A. (2005). *Discovering statistics using SPSS* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications Limited.
- Figgatt, S. (2020, April 30). Reentry reforms are more critical than ever amid the coronavirus pandemic. *Center for American Progress*.  
<https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/poverty/news/2020/04/30/484168/reentry-reforms-critical-ever-amid-coronavirus-pandemic/>
- Giordano, P. C. (2014). Gender, crime, and desistance: Toward a theory of cognitive

- transformation. In J. A. Humphrey & P. Cordella (Eds.), *Effective interventions in the lives of criminal offenders* (pp. 41–62). Springer.
- Giordano, P. C., Cernkovich, S. A., & Rudolph, J. L. (2002). Gender, crime and desistance: Toward a theory of cognitive transformation. *American Journal of Sociology*, *107*, 990–1064. <https://doi.org/10.1086/343191>
- Giordano, P. C., Schroeder, R. D., & Cernkovich, S. A. (2007). Emotions and crime over the life course: A neo-Meadian perspective on criminal continuity and change. *American Journal of Sociology*, *112*, 1603–1661.
- Göbbels, S., Ward, T., & Willis, G. M. (2012). An integrative theory of desistance from sex offending. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *17*(5), 453–462. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2012.06.003>
- Göbbels, S., Willis, G. M., & Ward, T. (2014). Current re-entry practices in sex offender treatment programmes: desistance facilitating or hindering? *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, *20*(3), 354–366. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13552600.2013.820850>
- Graffam, J., Shinkfield, A., Lavelle, B., & McPherson, W. (2004). Variables affecting successful reintegration as perceived by offenders and professionals. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, *40*(1–2), 147–171. [https://doi.org/10.1300/J076v40n01\\_08](https://doi.org/10.1300/J076v40n01_08)
- Hosier, P. (2020, March 22). Nearly half of Tasmania’s released prisoners are locked up again within 2 years. *ABC News*. <https://www.abc.net.au/news/2020-03-22/half-tasmanian-prisoners-likely-to-be-back-in-jail-in-2-years/12059210>
- La Vigne, N., Visher, C. A., & Castro, J. (2004). *Chicago prisoners’ experiences returning home*. The Urban Institute
- Landis, J. R., & Koch, G. G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics*, *33*(1), 159. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2529310>
- Laub, J. H., & Sampson, R. J. (2003). *Shared beginnings, divergent lives: Delinquent boys to age 70*. Harvard University Press.
- LeBel, T. P., Burnett, R., Maruna, S., & Bushway, S. (2008). The “chicken and egg” of subjective and social factors in desistance from crime. *European Journal of Criminology*, *5*, 131–159. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1477370807087640>

- Link, N. W., Ward, J. T., & Stansfield, R. (2019). Consequences of mental and physical health for reentry and recidivism: Toward a health-based model of desistance. *Criminology*, *57*(3), 544–573. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9125.12213>
- Lowry, R. (2015). *VassarStats: Website for statistical computation*. <http://vassarstats.net/index.html>
- Maruna, S. (2001). *Making good: How ex-convicts reform and rebuild their lives*. American Psychological Association.
- Maruna, S., & Farrell, S. (2004). Desistance from crime: A theoretical reformulation. *Kolner Zeitschrift Fur Soziologie Und Sozialpsychologie*, *43*, 171–194.
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, *50*(4), 370–396. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0054346>
- Metraux, S., & Culhane, D. P. (2004). Homeless shelter use and reincarceration following prison release. *Criminology and Public Policy*, *3*(2), 139–160. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9133.2004.tb00031.x>
- Nadesu, A. (2007). *Reconviction patterns of released prisoners: A 36-months follow-up analysis*. New Zealand Department of Corrections.
- Odgers, C. L., Moffitt, T. E., Broadbent, J. M., Dickson, N., Hancox, R. J., Harrington, H., Poulton, R., Sears, M. R., Thomson, W. M., & Caspi, A. (2008). Female and male antisocial trajectories: From childhood origins to adult outcomes. *Development and Psychopathology*, *20*(2), 673–716. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579408000333>
- Opie, A. (2012). *From outlaw to citizen: Making the transition from prison in New Zealand*. Dunmore Publishing Ltd.
- Pallant, J. (2010). *SPSS survival manual*. Open University Press.
- Polaschek, D. L. L. (2019). The psychology of desistance. In D. L. L. Polaschek, A. Day, & C. R. Hollin (Eds.), *The Wiley International Handbook of Correctional Psychology* (pp. 315–336). Wiley.
- Polaschek, D. L. L., & Yesberg, J. A. (2015). Desistance in high-risk prisoners: Pre-release self-reported desistance commitment and perceptions of change predict 12-month

survival. *Practice: The New Zealand Corrections Journal*, 3(1), 24–29.

Polaschek, D. L. L., Yesberg, J. A., Bell, R. K., Casey, A. R., & Dickson, S. R. (2016).

Intensive psychological treatment of high-risk violent offenders: Outcomes and pre-release mechanisms. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 22(4), 344–365.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/1068316X.2015.1109088>

Polaschek, D. L. L., Yesberg, J. A., & Chauhan, P. (2018). A year without a conviction: An

integrated examination of potential mechanisms for successful re-entry in high-risk violent prisoners. *Criminal Justice & Behavior*, 45, 425–446. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854>

[org/10.1177/0093854](https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854)

Reising, K., Ttofi, M. M., Farrington, D. P., & Piquero, A. R. (2019). Depression and anxiety

outcome of offending trajectories: A systematic review of prospective longitudinal studies. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 62, 3–15.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjust.2018.05.002>

Rocque, M., Posick, C., & Paternoster, R. (2016). Identities through time: An exploration of

identity change as a cause of desistance. *Justice Quarterly*, 33, 45–72.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2014.894111>

Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (2005). A life-course view of the development of crime. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 602(1), 12–45.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716205280075>

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716205280075>

Serin, R. C., & Lloyd, C. D. (2009). Examining the process of offender change: the transition

to crime desistance. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 15(4), 347–364.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/10683160802261078>

Shinkfield, A. J., & Graffam, J. (2009). Community reintegration of ex-prisoners: Type and

degree of change in variables influencing successful reintegration. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 53(1), 29–42.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X07309757>

Solomon, A. L., Visher, C. A., La Vigne, N., & Osborne, J. (2006). *Understanding the*

*challenges of prisoner reentry: Research findings from the Urban Institute's prisoner reentry portfolio*. The Urban Institute.

- Stevens, J. P. (1992). *Applied multivariate statistics* (2nd ed.). Erlbaum.
- Taylor, D. (2019, October 29). Prisoner rehabilitation does not work, says former prison boss. *The Guardian*. <https://www.theguardian.com/society/2019/oct/29/prisoner-rehabilitation-does-not-work-says-former-prisons-boss>
- Visher, C. A., Debus, S., & Yahner, J. (2008). *Employment after prison: A longitudinal study of releasees in three states*. The Urban Institute.
- Visher, C. A., & Travis, J. (2003). Transitions from prison to community: Understanding individual pathways. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 29(1), 89–113.  
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.29.010202.095931>
- Wilson, N. J. (2011). Release-proposal feasibility assessment-revised. Unpublished manuscript. Department of Corrections, Wellington, New Zealand.
- Wong, S. C. P., & Gordon, A. (2006). The validity and reliability of the Violence Risk Scale: A treatment-friendly violence risk assessment tool. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 12(3), 279–309. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8971.12.3.279>
- Yesberg, J. A., & Polaschek, D. L. L. (2015). Assessing dynamic risk and protective factors in the community: examining the validity of the Dynamic Risk Assessment for Offender Re-entry. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 21(1), 80–99.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1068316X.2014.935775>
- Zamble, E., & Quinsey, V. L. (1997). *The criminal recidivism process*. Cambridge University Press.

Table 1

*Factor Loadings for Principal Components Analysis With Orthogonal Rotation*

Parole Experiences Measure Item	Component 1	Component 2
E1 Accommodation	-.04	<b>.59</b>
E2 Personal Support	.14	<b>.71</b>
E3 Antisocial Associates	.05	<b>.60</b>
E4 Finances	.08	<b>.65</b>
E5 Alcohol Use	.13	<b>.47</b>
E6 Drug Use	.23	<b>.58</b>
S1 Physical Health	<b>.42</b>	-.05
S2 Mental Health	<b>.81</b>	.15
S3 Positive Emotions	<b>.75</b>	.12
S4 Feeling Today	<b>.79</b>	.13
S5 Feeling Over Last Month	<b>.78</b>	.26
S6 Negative Emotions	<b>.69</b>	.15

*Note.* The highest loading for each item is highlighted in bold

Table 2  
*Means, Standard Deviations, and Ranges for PEM Items*

PEM Item	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Original Item Range
E1 Accommodation	0.68	0.28	1-4
E2 Personal support	0.67	0.37	1-4
E3 Antisocial associates	0.54	0.33	1-4
E4 Finances	0.62	0.29	1-4
E5 Alcohol Use	0.82	0.30	1-4
E6 Drug Use	0.79	0.38	1-4
External circumstances subscale total	4.11	1.22	---
S1 Physical health	0.85	0.20	1-6
S2 Mental health	0.76	0.23	1-6
S3 Feeling today	0.83	0.23	1-6
S4 Feeling over last month	0.77	0.25	1-6
S5 Positive emotions	0.77	0.25	0-5
S6 Negative emotions	0.73	0.17	0-21
Subjective wellbeing subscale total	4.73	0.96	---
PEM total	9.29	1.42	---

*Note.* All variables were scaled to fit a 0 to 1 metric before summing and presenting here for visual comparison. The range indicates how many points there were on the original scale (e.g., 4 = original item was rated 1 to 4.) All other analyses use scores standardized from the raw data.

Table 3

*Logistic Regressions Predicting Likelihood of Recidivism in the First 12 Months Post-Release*

Scale	Breaches of Parole Conditions (n=155) <sup>a</sup>				Reconviction (Excluding Breaches) (n=150) <sup>b</sup>				Reconviction Resulting in Reimprisonment (n=156) <sup>c</sup>			
	<i>B</i> (SE)	Wald	Odds ratio	95% CI	<i>B</i> (SE)	Wald	Odds ratio	95% CI	<i>B</i> (SE)	Wald	Odds ratio	95% CI
Model 1												
Total PEM	-.71 (.36)	<b>3.89*</b>	.49	[.24, 1.00]	-.77 (.38)	<b>4.03*</b>	.47	[.22, .98]	-.81 (.38)	<b>4.64*</b>	.44	[.21, .93]
Model 2 <sup>d</sup>												
External circumstances subscale	-.17 (.35)	.25	.84	[.43, 1.66]	-.75 (.38)	<b>3.99*</b>	.47	[.23, .99]	-.68 (.38)	3.15+	.51	[.24, 1.07]
Subjective wellbeing subscale	-.49 (.28)	3.01	.62	[.36, 1.07]	-.14 (.29)	.23	.87	[.50, 1.53]	-.24 (.28)	.77	.78	[.46, 1.35]

*Note.* In all models, two measures completed based on information immediately prior to release—VRS scores, and the quality of the release plan, based on the Release Proposal Feasibility Assessment-Revised scores (Wilson, 2011; see Polschek, Yesberg, & Chauhan, 2018 for more information)—and treatment status (HRSTU or comparison) were controlled for. In the model predicting reconviction, RoC\*RoI scores were also controlled for.

*Note.* pseudo- $R^2$  = Cox & Snell – Nagelkerke.

<sup>a</sup>Model 1 pseudo- $R^2$  = .03–.04,  $\chi^2$  (1) = 3.92,  $p$  = .048; Model 2 pseudo- $R^2$  = .03–.05,  $\chi^2$  (2) = 4.30,  $p$  = .117

<sup>b</sup> Model 1 pseudo- $R^2 = .11-.15$ ,  $\chi^2 (1) = 4.25$ ,  $p = .039$ ; Model 2 pseudo- $R^2 = .11-.15$ ,  $\chi^2 (2) = 5.58$ ,  $p = .061$

<sup>c</sup> Model 1 pseudo- $R^2 = .06-.08$ ,  $\chi^2 (1) = 4.74$ ,  $p = .030$ ; Model 2 pseudo- $R^2 = .06-.09$ ,  $\chi^2 (2) = 5.40$ ,  $p = .067$

<sup>d</sup> Both PEM subscales were entered simultaneously in the regressions.

\* $p < .05$ , + $p < .10$