



ARCHIVED - Archiving Content

Archived Content

Information identified as archived is provided for reference, research or recordkeeping purposes. It is not subject to the Government of Canada Web Standards and has not been altered or updated since it was archived. Please contact us to request a format other than those available.

ARCHIVÉE - Contenu archivé

Contenu archivé

L'information dont il est indiqué qu'elle est archivée est fournie à des fins de référence, de recherche ou de tenue de documents. Elle n'est pas assujettie aux normes Web du gouvernement du Canada et elle n'a pas été modifiée ou mise à jour depuis son archivage. Pour obtenir cette information dans un autre format, veuillez communiquer avec nous.

This document is archival in nature and is intended for those who wish to consult archival documents made available from the collection of Public Safety Canada.

Some of these documents are available in only one official language. Translation, to be provided by Public Safety Canada, is available upon request.

Le présent document a une valeur archivistique et fait partie des documents d'archives rendus disponibles par Sécurité publique Canada à ceux qui souhaitent consulter ces documents issus de sa collection.

Certains de ces documents ne sont disponibles que dans une langue officielle. Sécurité publique Canada fournira une traduction sur demande.

_____ **Research Report** _____

**Factors Related to Community
Supervision Outcomes:
Revocations**

Ce rapport est également disponible en français. Pour en obtenir un exemplaire, veuillez vous adresser à la Direction de la recherche, Service correctionnel du Canada, 340, avenue Laurier Ouest, Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0P9.

This report is also available in French. Should additional copies be required, they can be obtained from the Research Branch, Correctional Service of Canada, 340 Laurier Ave. West, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0P9.

**Factors Related to Community Supervision Outcomes:
Revocations**

Jennie Thompson

Trina K. Forrester

&

Lynn A. Stewart

Correctional Service of Canada

January 2015

Acknowledgements

We would like to extend our appreciation Katie Tam and Emad Talisman for their contributions to this report. Many thanks to several individuals who worked on previous conceptualizations and versions of this report: Colette Cousineau, Renee Gobeil, Sara Johnson, Katie Fleming, Geoff Barnum, and Leslie Helmus. Finally, thank you also to Craig Townsend and Andrea Moser for their review and feedback on the draft report.

Executive Summary

Key words: *returns to custody, recidivism, revocation of conditional release, release outcomes, community supervision, risk factors.*

The successful transition of offenders to the community is a priority for the Correctional Service of Canada (CSC). In addition to enhancing public safety, promoting reintegration reduces costs to the taxpayers given that community supervision is about one-quarter the cost of incarceration.

The current study identified factors associated with offenders' first revocation of conditional release for any reason for four groups: Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal men, and Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal women. A second analysis examined factors related to the first revocation for an offence among Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal men. Information was retrieved on all 12,690 federal offenders who were granted their first discretionary (i.e., day or full parole) or statutory release between April 1, 2010 and March 31, 2013.

Results showed that between 24% and 56% of offenders were revoked during their conditional release. Most revocations (over 80%) occurred within the first year after release. Non-Aboriginal women offenders had the lowest rates of return to custody among the four groups examined and Aboriginal men had the highest. Rates of revocation for an offence ranged from 4% to 12% across the groups, with non-Aboriginal men and women having lower rates than either the Aboriginal men or women.

Risk factors having the biggest impact on risk for revocation varied among the groups and whether the outcome assessed was a revocation for a new offence or a revocation for any reason. For non-Aboriginal men, those who had the poorest outcomes were young, had poor institutional adjustment, were released on statutory release, and had low or medium reintegration potential. Moreover, those with dynamic needs related to substance abuse, employment, and community functioning are at greater risk for revocation. Among Aboriginal men, those most likely to have their conditional release revoked were young, had poor institutional adjustment, received a statutory release, and had medium or high static risk rating as well as dynamic needs relating to employment, attitudes, and community functioning. The risk of revocation among women was highest among those with a Computerised Assessment of Substance Abuse (CASA-W) recommendation for substance abuse treatment, those who had been found guilty of an institutional offence, those released from higher security levels, and those on a statutory release.

Understanding the impact of these factors can be useful in developing more effective community supervision strategies, firstly, by identifying profiles of offenders who will require closer supervision and more intensive interventions (consistent with the Risk Principle in the effective corrections literature) and, secondly, by identifying which dynamic factors are empirically related to poor outcomes and should be targeted for change during supervision (consistent with the Need Principle). As CSC introduces its Structured Assessment and Intervention Framework (SAIF) initiative the implications of this study could inform policies and staff training.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	ii
Executive Summary.....	iii
List of Tables.....	v
Introduction.....	1
Demographic Factors.....	1
Sentence- and Risk-related Factors.....	2
Release-related Factors.....	3
Method.....	5
Data/Population.....	5
Measures.....	5
Analytic Approach.....	6
Results.....	8
First Revocation of Conditional Release.....	8
Factors Related to First Revocation of Conditional Release for Any Reason.....	9
Factors Related to Revocation of Conditional Release is for a New Offence.....	12
Discussion.....	14
First Revocation of Conditional Release for Any Reason.....	14
First Revocation of Conditional Release is for a New Offence.....	15
What these Findings Mean for Case Management.....	16
Limitations.....	17
Conclusion.....	18
References.....	19
Appendix A: Additional Analyses.....	24

List of Tables

Table 1 <i>Percentage of Each Group Experiencing First Revocation during Conditional Release by Type of First Return and Timing of Return.</i>	8
Table A1 <i>Profile of Offenders by Gender and Aboriginal Ancestry.</i>	24
Table A2 <i>Association between Demographic-, Sentence-, Risk- , and Release-related Factors and First Revocation for Any Reason by Group.</i>	26
Table A3 <i>Association between Demographic-, Sentence-, Risk- , and Release-related Indicators and First Revocation for Any Reason by Group (Hazard Ratios).</i>	28
Table A4 <i>Association between Demographic-, Sentence-, Risk-, and Release-related Factors and First Revocation is for an Offence by Group.</i>	29
Table A5 <i>Multivariate Relationship between Demographic-, Sentence-, Risk- , And Release-related Indicators and First Revocation Of Conditional Release is for an Offence by Group (Hazard Ratios).</i>	31

Introduction

With rare exceptions, federally sentenced offenders spend at least a portion of their sentence in the community under the supervision of Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) staff. The successful transition of offenders to the community is a top priority for CSC (CSC, 2013). In addition to enhanced public safety, offender success in the community has the added benefit of reducing costs to the taxpayers given that community supervision is about one-quarter the cost of incarceration¹. Thus, many researchers, correctional staff, and policy-makers have focussed on determining the readiness of offenders for supervised release to the community. In order to facilitate successful community outcomes, considerable attention has been paid to the characteristics of offenders likely to be unsuccessful on release, including their demographic- and risk- and sentence-related information, as well as release-related factors. Identifying at-risk offenders and targeting them for more intensive supervision and specific interventions are key risk management strategies.

Demographic Factors

Previous research has shown that a number of demographic characteristics such as age, gender, ethnicity, marital status, and educational attainment are associated with release outcomes. Age is one of the most consistently identified factors in predicting recidivism, with younger offenders more likely to re-offend (Bahr, Harrie, Fisher, & Harker, 2010; Gendreau, Little, & Goggin, 1996; Jung, Spjeldnes, & Yamatani, 2010; Makarios, Steiner, & Travis, 2010; Piquero, Jennings, Diamond, & Reingle, 2013; Ryan, 1997; Sims & Jones, 1997; Zhang, Zhang, & Vaughn, 2009). Gender is another strong risk factor; women are less likely to reoffend than men (Cobbina, Huebner, & Berg, 2012; Cortoni, Hanson, & Coache, 2010; Gendreau et al., 1996; Mackenzie, Browning, Skroban, & Smith, 1999; Makarios et al., 2010; Morgan, 1994; Piquero et al., 2013; Ulmer, 2001). Recent Canadian estimates also indicate a lower rate of return to custody for women than men while on release, although the difference can vary by type of supervision (Public Safety, 2013). Patterns of re-offending linked with membership in ethnocultural groups vary, but in Canada, Aboriginal offenders tend to re-offend at higher rates than non-Aboriginal offenders (Bunday & Kiri, 1992; Gendreau et al., 1996; Gutierrez, Wilson,

¹The annual cost of supervising an offender in the community is substantially less than incarceration. On average, it costs approximately \$35,101 per year to supervise one offender in the community compared to \$117,788 per year to keep one offender incarcerated (Public Safety Canada, 2013).

Rugge & Bonta, 2013; Jung et al., 2010; Sims & Jones, 1997; Zhang et al., 2010). Research also indicates that offenders who are married or living with a spouse have better success on release than those who are single (see Collins, 2010; Mackenzie & DeLi, 2002; Morgan, 1994; Paolucci, Violato, & Schofield, 2000; Sims & Jones, 1997) and it has been noted that individuals with higher levels of education are less likely to return to custody (Blomberg, Bales, & Piquero, 2012; Fabelo, 2002; Harlow, 2003; Nally, Lockwood, Ho, & Knutson, 2012; Nuttall, Hollmen, & Staley, 2003; Vacca, 2004; Wilson, Gallagher, & MacKenzie, 2000).

Sentence- and Risk-related Factors

Factors related to offenders' sentences and criminal history have been consistently associated with reintegration outcomes. These include offence type, length of sentence, institutional behaviour, and ratings of on static and dynamic risk assessments². Specifically, research has consistently found recidivism rates to be lowest for offenders serving sentences for sex, homicide, and drug offences, and highest for theft and property offences (Cortoni et al., 2010; Holland, Pointon, & Ross, 2007; Jones, Hua, Donnelly, McHutchison, & Heggie, 2006; Liem, 2013; Thompson, 1995). Furthermore, some research has pointed to longer sentence length (Kronick, Lambert, & Lambert, 1998; Sims & Jones, 1997; Zhang et al., 2009) and poor institutional behaviour during incarceration (Hill, 1985; Ryan, 1997) as factors associated with an increased likelihood of recidivism, although this is not a consistent finding (Freiburger & Iaannacchione, 2011).

A key factor strongly associated with successful community release outcome is the extent of the criminal history (i.e., static risk). The volume of past crime is one of the best single predictors of re-offending (Menzies & Webster, 1995). Both juvenile criminal behaviour (Cooke & Michie, 1998; Morgan, 1994; Peersen, Sigurdsson, Gudjonsson, & Gretarsson, 2004) and previous adult convictions (Cooke & Michie, 1998; Peersen et al, 2004; Sims & Jones, 1997; Ulmer, 2001; Zhang et al., 2009) are linked to higher re-offending rates. In addition, offenders who violate probation orders tend to re-offend more quickly than those who do not (Jones et al., 2006).

Dynamic risk level, also referred to as criminogenic need level, is significantly associated with community outcomes (see Dowden & Andrews, 2000; Gendreau et al., 1996; Grant &

²CSC measures static risk by assessing criminal history, offence severity, sex offence history. Dynamic risk is measured by an analysis and assessment of seven domains including: employment, marital/family, associates/social interaction, substance abuse, community functioning, personal/emotional orientation, and attitude.

Gillis, 1999; Jones, Brown, & Zamble, 2010; Latessa & Lowenkamp, 2005; Makarios et al., 2010). Offenders with higher rates of anti-social, anti-authority, and pro-criminal attitudes are at increased risk of recidivating (Gendreau et al., 1996; Lloyd & Serin, 2011; Mills, Anderson & Kroner, 2004; Mills & Kroner, 2006; Mills, Kroner & Forth, 2002; Mills, Kroner, & Hemmati, 2004; Yessine & Kroner, 2004; Ryan, 1997). Association with criminal peers (Mills et al., 2004; Nilsson, 2003) and the problematic consumption of alcohol and/or drugs are also consistently linked to poorer community outcomes (Cooke & Michie, 1998; Dowden & Brown, 2002; Mackenzie et al., 1999; Mackenzie & De Li, 2002; Makarios et al., 2010; Nilsson, 2003; Peersen et al., 2004; Shinkfield & Graffam, 2009).

Release-related Factors

Past research has examined correctional outcomes based on the type of release³ and the number and types of parole conditions imposed (Grant & Gillis, 1999; Ostermann, 2013; Parole Board of Canada, 2013; Solomon, Kachnowski, & Bhati, 2005; Steiner, Makarios, Travis, & Meade, 2012; Verbrugge, Nunes, Johnson, & Taylor, 2002). Lower risk offenders are more likely to be granted discretionary release while high-risk offenders typically are not released until their statutory release dates. This explains why offenders released on day and full parole are less likely to re-offend compared to offenders on statutory release (Parole Board of Canada, 2013). Consistent with this finding, Soloman et al. (2005) argued that success while under supervision depends on factors such as offence type, number of prior arrests, gender, and level of risk.

There is conflicting evidence for the effectiveness of parole conditions and post-release supervision in curbing recidivism. Ostermann (2013), for example, found that receiving a conditional release is associated with a lower likelihood of returning to custody. Delveaux et al. (2012) found the likelihood of returning to custody decreased for each new condition type imposed, especially when these conditions corresponded with the offenders' criminogenic need (e.g., substance abuse). Nonetheless, some studies suggest that the nature and number of release conditions were unrelated to revocation rates for some populations (Delveaux et al.,

³In Canada, offenders can receive three forms of conditional release: Day and full parole are both forms of discretionary release. Day parole provides the opportunity to participate in on-going community-based activities while typically residing at a correctional institution or community residence (CSC, 2012). On full parole, offenders must abide by conditions designed to reduce re-offending, while reporting regularly to a parole supervisor (CSC, 2012). Statutory Release requires offenders with determinate sentences to serve the final third of their sentence in the community under supervision and conditions of release similar to those imposed on offenders released on full parole (CSC, 2012).

2012) or even that increased frequency of contact and closer supervision can result in higher rates of revocation for technical violations.

Overall, the understanding of factors associated with successful release can allow for the refinement of targeted interventions and policies to best facilitate successful release outcomes; however, there is inconsistency in the way in which successful outcomes are defined. For example, a release may be considered successful if an offender avoids breaching conditions or avoids committing a new offence. There is very little Canadian research focussed on examining the relationship between selected risk factors and revocation of conditional release. Moreover, no research was identified explicitly examining whether differences in the importance of these factors vary by Aboriginal ancestry and gender, even though rates of revocation vary greatly across these groups.

The current study aims to address these gaps in the literature by addressing the following questions:

1. What are the rates of revocation of conditional release? What are these rates when examined by Aboriginal ancestry and by gender?
2. What demographic characteristics, risk- and sentence-related information and release-related factors are associated with revocation of conditional release for non-Aboriginal and Aboriginal men and non-Aboriginal and Aboriginal women?
3. What are the rates of first revocation of conditional release for a new offence? What are these rates when examined by Aboriginal ancestry and by gender?
4. What demographic characteristics, risk- and sentence-related information and release-related factors are associated with the likelihood of revocation for a new offence? What are these rates disaggregated by Aboriginal ancestry and gender.

Method

Data/Population

Information was obtained from the Offender Management System (OMS) databases of the Correctional Service of Canada. This electronic database holds all information pertinent to the management of federally sentenced offenders. Information was retrieved regarding all 12,690 federal offenders who were granted their first discretionary (i.e., day or full parole) or statutory release between April 1, 2010 and March 31, 2013. Non-Aboriginal men accounted for 76% of the population, while Aboriginal⁴ men, non-Aboriginal women, and Aboriginal women respectively accounted for the remaining 17%, 5%, and 2%.

The groups of offenders varied in the composition of their profiles at intake (see Table A1 in Appendix A). Overall, men and women offenders of Aboriginal ancestry were younger than those of non-Aboriginal ancestry and Aboriginal women had considerably higher ratings of dynamic risk than the other groups.

Measures

Four measures of the first revocation of conditional release were examined. The first considered whether a revocation occurred or not. The second measure considered whether the first revocation was for an offence. The third examined whether the first offence was for a violent or sexual crime. The final measure examined whether the first revocation of conditional release was for a sexual offence only. Generally, each measure is a subset of the preceding measure.

In addition to the various measures of revocation of conditional release, several demographic-, sentence-, and release-related factors were examined. These factors included: age at release; marital status, and whether the offender had at least a high school education. Assessment of overall static risk and overall dynamic risk was extracted from the Offender Intake Assessment (CSC, 2012). Several items assessed offenders' ability to fulfill their correctional plans, including motivation level; potential for successful reintegration; accountability for actions; responsivity issues related to intervention participation; and engagement in the correctional process. Security level placement as well as whether the individual had been found guilty of an institutional charge or had been transferred to segregation

⁴Aboriginal offenders include those who self-report Inuit, Métis, or First Nations ancestry and non-Aboriginal offenders included all other offenders.

were included as indicators of institutional conduct. Finally, factors related to release decisions were considered. These factors included whether the release was discretionary or statutory, type of parole conditions on the conditional release, whether any suspensions of conditional release occurred, the reasons for suspensions, as well as the assessment of risk factors conducted closest to the time of release.

Analytic Approach

All analyses were conducted separately for each group. Analyses included the examination of all factors and the outcomes of interest controlling for time at risk⁵. Using Cox regression⁶, the relationships between all demographic characteristics, risk- and sentence-related information and released-related factors and outcome (whether an offender had a first revocation of their conditional release) were assessed for each group before constructing a model that included all the factors together. Those variables that the first analysis indicated contributed no or trivial associations with outcome were excluded from the model combining multiple factors. The variables with the largest relationships with revocation were entered into each of the models first. In some cases, when variables are highly correlated, the variable which contributed the most to the outcome was retained.

A final model containing only the strongest factors is presented for each group. This method has the advantage of reflecting the impact of a factor when many are considered and more accurately reflects the complexity of offender outcomes. It should be noted, however, that if a variable was not included in the model it does not necessarily mean that it is not related to outcomes, but rather, it may be that other factors are so important that they “drown out” the impact of this variable. For example, offenders released on statutory release are those who are

⁵ The offenders had varying periods of time during which they could be under community supervision before their sentence expired or the study ended. In the current study, 50% of each of the non-Aboriginal men, Aboriginal men, non-Aboriginal women and Aboriginal women had at least 429, 514, 404, and 466 days to be potentially supervised in the community on conditional release, respectively. The variation in the potential time under supervision is related to the type of release. For example, offenders granted discretionary conditional release, if not revoked, will serve a greater proportion of their sentence in the community compared to those who are given statutory release. Thus, offenders granted discretionary release had the possibility of much longer follow-up periods than those who release on statutory release (see Table A2). In fact, over 50% of the population on statutory release had less than one-year of possible follow-up. Given these differences, it was necessary to control for follow-up time. It was not possible to conduct fixed-follow-up analyses of periods longer than six month since this would disproportionately remove offenders on statutory release, biasing findings; therefore, Cox regression provided an alternative way to account for these variations in time at risk.

⁶Cox regression considers the risk (i.e., hazard) of an event occurring (e.g., revocation of conditional release) as a function of time and predictor variables. A hazard ratio of 1.0 would indicate no impact of a particular factor whereas a ratio greater than 1 would indicate an increased risk for revocation, and a ratio less than 1 would suggest a decreased risk of revocation.

high risk; thus, including statutory release as a variable in a model means that other variables have to demonstrate an impact beyond that accounted for by this release type.

Results

First Revocation of Conditional Release

The percentage of each group revoked on a conditional release varied across groups from a low of 24% among non-Aboriginal women to a high of 56% among Aboriginal men (see Table 1). Generally, men and Aboriginal offenders are more likely to experience a revocation than women or non-Aboriginal offenders. For those who were revoked, the majority (over 80%) were revoked within 1 year of release. For virtually all offenders who were revoked (at least 98%) their first revocation occurred within the first two years of release.

Table 1

Percentage of Each Group Experiencing First Revocation during Conditional Release by Type of First Return and Timing of Return.

Type of Revocation	Group			
	Non-Aboriginal Men (N = 9,622)	Aboriginal Men (N = 2,246)	Non-Aboriginal Women (N = 587)	Aboriginal Women (N = 235)
	%	%	%	%
First revocation – any reason				
Any period of time	36	56	24	54
Revocation occurred within 6 months of conditional release	46	52	38	43
Revocation occurred within 1 year of conditional release	83	89	80	87
Revocation occurred within 2 year of conditional release	98	99	97	98
First revocation – is with an offence				
Any period of time	6	12	4	12
Revocation occurred within 6 months of conditional release	39	46	27	39
Revocation occurred within 1 year of conditional release	79	87	73	86
Revocation occurred within 2 year of conditional release	98	98	96	96

A much smaller percentage of offenders, however, have a first return to custody because they re-offended. Across groups, 4% to 12% are revoked for a new offence. Rates of violent and sexual offences are lower still; only 1% (78) of offenders returned with either a violent or a

sexual offence. Given these low numbers, we restricted our analyses to examination of first revocation for any reason and first revocation for any new offence.

Factors Related to First Revocation of Conditional Release for Any Reason

When considering the impact of each factor individually for all groups, most of the selected demographic-, sentence-, risk-, and release-related factors were significantly associated with revocations. The number of factors that were significantly associated with outcome varied, however, by group (see Appendix A, Table A2). The factors identified below are the *most important* ones in identifying those at higher risk to be revoked when factors are considered together.

Non-Aboriginal men. Several factors⁷ were related to an increased likelihood of revocation for non-Aboriginal men (see Table A3). These factors included:

- being single,
- having a longer sentence,
- having been found guilty of an institutional offence,
- being at medium or maximum levels of security at release,
- being younger at release⁸,
- being granted statutory release rather than discretionary release,
- having a drug-related special condition while under supervision,
- having high or moderate dynamic risk,
- having low or moderate reintegration potential,
- having criminogenic needs related to employment and/or education, substance abuse, and community functioning.

The impact of each of these factors ranged from a 17% increase in the likelihood of revocation (e.g., statutory release and having an employment need at release) to almost 3 times more likely to experience a revocation (e.g., having a low reintegration potential). One factor, having an

⁷ Analyses were also conducted to include static factor assessment items related to criminal history; however, due to large amount of missing data, it was not possible include these items the full model. Nevertheless, there was some evidence that factors such as having previous provincial or federal terms or having pervious failures on community-based supervision were all associated with an increased likelihood of revocation of conditional release among non-Aboriginal men.

⁸ For each year older, an offender is we can expect a decrease in the likelihood of experiencing a revocation (see Table A3).

“other”⁹ type of condition, was actually related to an 8% decrease in the likelihood of revocation.

Aboriginal men. A number of unique factors¹⁰ were associated with the likelihood of revocation among Aboriginal men including the following:

- being single,
- having been found guilty of an institutional offence,
- being at medium or maximum levels of security at release,
- being younger at release,
- being granted statutory release rather than discretionary release,
- having a drug-related special condition while under supervision,
- having high or moderate static risk,
- having criminogenic needs related to employment and/or education and attitudes.

The impact of these factors increased the likelihood of revocation from 23% to 86% depending on the factor (see Table A3).

Non-Aboriginal women. Fewer factors¹¹ were associated with the revocation among non-Aboriginal women. These factors included:

- having a W-CASA recommendation for substance abuse treatment at intake¹²
- having had been found guilty of an institutional offence,

⁹ Several types of conditions were collapsed into an “other” category given the small number of individuals who receive these conditions and the imperfect conceptual mapping of these categories into other larger category of conditions. The following were included in the larger “other” type of conditions category: reporting to police, abstaining from driving, abstaining from gambling, avoid certain place, deportation (voluntary or not), avoiding a gambling establishment, not to gamble, motor vehicle restrictions, reporting romantic relationships, disclosure of financial information, must seek employment, pornography restriction, computer network restrictions, telecommunication restrictions, needing to respect a curfew and other.

¹⁰ Analyses were also conducted to include static factor assessment items related to criminal history; however, due to large amount of missing data, it was not possible to include these items in the full model. Nevertheless, analyses with the available information revealed that having previous failure on community supervision as an adult and previous provincial or federal terms were associated with an increased likelihood of revocation among Aboriginal men.

¹¹ Analyses were also conducted to include static factor assessment items related to criminal history; however, due to large amount of missing data, it was not possible to include these items in the full model. Among non-Aboriginal women who had this information available, having a previous failure during community-based supervision or scheduled convictions as a youth were also related to increased likelihood of revocation.

¹² At admission, women offenders complete the Women’s Computerized Assessment of Substance Abuse (W-CASA), which assesses the scope and severity of the offenders drug and alcohol use; from this assessment a recommendation is generated as to whether an offender could benefit from a substance abuse intervention. Offenders are recommended for a substance abuse intervention if substance abuse was related to their offence cycle. Men offenders complete the Computerized Assessment of Substance Abuse (CASA); however, it was not associated with revocations among men when other factors were considered.

- being at the maximum level of security at release,
- being granted statutory release rather than discretionary release,
- having a drug-related special condition while under supervision,
- having criminogenic needs related to employment and/or marital relations or family.

The range in the extent to which each of the factors related to revocation was quite large. For example, having marital- and/or family-related criminogenic needs increased the likelihood of revocation by 56%. Notably, among women, those with a drug or alcohol-related special condition were almost 4 times more likely to have a revocation (see Table A3).

Aboriginal women. The fewest factors¹³ were associated with the revocation among Aboriginal women. These factors included the following:

- having a W-CASA recommendation for substance abuse treatment at intake,
- having had an institutional charge,
- being at the maximum level of security at release,
- being granted statutory release rather than discretionary release.

The factors varied in their impact on the likelihood of revocation. For example, statutory release was associated with a 56% increase in the chance of revocation when compared to those who were granted discretionary release (see Table A3). Women who were recommended for substance abuse interventions by the W-CASA were 2.6 times more likely than those not being recommended to experience a revocation.

Overall, there was significant variation in the number and type of factors associated with revocation among each of the groups of offenders. Notably, only three factors were consistently related to experiencing a revocation across all groups: having had an institutional offence before release, being released from a security level higher than minimum security, and being released on statutory release. The remainder of the risk factors explored were unique to each group.

Although information that could assist case managers in mitigating the general risk of revocations is important, the focus of supervision, and the primary public safety goal, is to reduce reoffending. Analyses examining factors related to revocations for a new offence are

¹³ Analyses were also conducted to include static factor assessment items related to criminal history; however, due to large amount of missing data, it was not possible include these items in the full model. These analyses did not reveal any static factor indicators associated with increased likelihood of revocation. This finding, however, may be related to the low number of cases available.

presented next.

Factors Related to Revocation of Conditional Release is for a New Offence

As noted in Table 1, the overall rate of first revocation being for a new offence ranged between 4% and 12% depending on the group of offenders examined. Given smaller numbers of offenders who returned on a first revocation involving an offence, it was not possible to conduct analyses separately for each group. In fact, only 54 women (Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal combined) experienced a first revocation due to re-offending. This outcome, therefore, was examined separately for non-Aboriginal and Aboriginal men only.

Among both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal men, many of the demographic-, sentence-, risk-, and release-related factors we examined were associated with revocation for a new offence; however, fewer were found for Aboriginal men than non-Aboriginal men (see Table A4). The factors identified below are the most important when identifying those who at higher risk of revocation.

Non-Aboriginal men. Factors¹⁴ related to an increased likelihood of a first revocation being for an offence among non-Aboriginal men (see Table A5) include:

- having been found guilty of an institutional offence,
- being younger at release,
- being granted statutory release rather than discretionary release,
- having a drug-related special condition while under supervision,
- having low motivation to participate in their correctional plan,
- having low or moderate reintegration potential,
- having criminogenic needs related to community functioning.
- having a suspension related to failing to report,
- having a suspension related to breach of conditions,
- having a suspension related to deteriorating or at-risk behaviour.

The impact of each of these factors ranged from a 28% increase in the likelihood of revocation

¹⁴ Analyses were also conducted to include static factor assessment items related to criminal history; however, due to large amount of missing data, it was not possible include these items the full model. These analyses, nonetheless, analyses indicated that having previous experiences of community supervision as a youth, failure on community-based supervision or conditional release as an adult were associated with an increased likelihood of having a first revocation with an offence.

for an offence (e.g., having an institutional offence) to almost 7 times (e.g., having a first suspension related to a failure to report) more likely to return. Notably, three factors were related to a decreased likelihood of revocation with an offence: having a residency condition, having an “other” type of condition, and being currently convicted of a scheduled offence. For example, having a residency condition lowered the likelihood of first revocation being for an offence by approximately 50%.

Aboriginal men. Factors¹⁵ related to the increased likelihood of first revocation of conditional release being for an offence among Aboriginal men included:

- having been found guilty of an institutional offence,
- being younger at release,
- being granted statutory release rather than discretionary release,
- having criminogenic needs related to community functioning,
- having a suspension related to failing to report.

These factors increased the likelihood of revocation from 56% (needs relating to community functioning) to over 3.5 times (being suspended for a failure to report; see Table A5). This is similar to the same result we found for non-Aboriginal men. For Aboriginal men, having a condition to follow mental health treatment or correctional programming while under community supervision was related to a decrease in the likelihood of being revoked with an offence.

¹⁵ Analyses were also conducted to include static factor assessment items related to criminal history; however, due to large amount of missing data, it was not possible to include these items the full model. Nevertheless, these analyses indicated that having a previous failure on community supervision as an adult and previous provincial or federal terms were associated with increased likelihood of revocation among Aboriginal men.

Discussion

The current study identified factors associated with the revocation of conditional release for four groups: Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal men, and Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal women. Identifying and understanding the impact of these factors can be helpful in planning and developing effective community supervision strategies, firstly, by identifying profiles of offenders who will require closer supervision and more intensive interventions (consistent with the Risk Principle in the effective corrections literature), and, secondly, by identifying which dynamic factors are empirically related to poor outcomes and, therefore, should be targeted for change during community supervision (the Need Principle).

First Revocation of Conditional Release for Any Reason

Between 24% and 56% group of offenders were revoked for any reason after their release. Consistent with previous literature, we found that non-Aboriginal women offenders had the lowest rates of return among the four groups examined (e.g., Cobbina, Huebner, & Berg, 2012; Cortoni, Hanson, & Coache, 2010; Gendreau et al., 1996; Mackenzie, Browning, Skroban, & Smith, 1999; Makarios et al., 2010; Morgan, 1994; Piquero et al., 2013; Ulmer, 2001). Notably, the rate of return for non-Aboriginal women was lower than estimates provided in Gobeil and Barrett (2008); however, this study used a broader definition of returns to custody, which could account for the difference. Both men and women Aboriginal offenders had rates of return higher than those of non-Aboriginal men and women, a finding consistent with previous literature (e.g., Bunday & Kiri, 1992; Gendreau et al., 1996; Gutierrez, Wilson, Rugge & Bonta, 2013; Jung et al., 2010; Sims & Jones, 1997; Zhang et al., 2010).

Many of our findings related to factors associated with release outcomes are consistent with previous research. Being single, extent of the criminal history, incurring misconducts during incarceration, and higher levels of dynamic risk (need) factors were all related to the likelihood of revocation, although which dynamic factors were most important depended on the group examined. For example, among Aboriginal men offenders, attitude-related needs were associated with a higher likelihood of revocation. Our research confirmed findings in the literature regarding the importance of younger age as a risk factor. In our study, rates of revocation decreased by 2% with each year increase in age. A well-established finding, confirmed in our study, is that offenders released on statutory, instead of a discretionary, release are more likely to fail.

Of interest is the finding that the relationship of specific factors with revocation varied across groups. Others have previously shown that the importance of risk factors can differ across samples (e.g., Broadhurst & Loh, 1995; Johnson, 2005). Guiterrez, Wilson, Rugge, and Bonta (2013) for example, found that while many factors predicted recidivism for both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal offenders, some were relatively more important for one group than the other. This suggests that interventions aimed at reducing the likelihood of revocation of conditional release could be more effective if they considered group-specific factors. These findings are consistent with CSC's Aboriginal continuum of care.

Although many of the factors identified are static and, therefore, cannot be changed through interventions (e.g., you cannot change a person's age or substance use history), knowing which offenders have factors related to elevated risk allows parole officers to identify those requiring more intensive supervision. Several dynamic factors, however, were identified that could be targeted for change through focussed interventions. Having needs in the areas of employment, substance abuse, and community functioning suggests that a focus on job training and job readiness, the monitoring and treatment for substance abuse problems, and the provision of assistance with community function factors such as accommodation and access to community services would be worthwhile targets during community supervision for offenders with needs in these areas.

First Revocation of Conditional Release is for a New Offence

The rate at which the first revocation of conditional release was for an offence was much lower than general rates of return, ranging from 4% to 12% across groups examined. Non-Aboriginal men and women had the lowest rates of revocation for a new offence. Because of small numbers, we were unable to statistically model factors associated with revocation with an offence among women. Many of the factors related to returns to custody for any reason were also related to revocation with an offence. These include statutory release, being younger, having been found guilty of an institutional offences, and criminal history indicators. Our research was able to examine important factors related to revocation for an offence that had not been previously noted in the literature. For example, we determined that having a first suspension for a failure to report was strongly related to a first return with an offence for both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal men as was having a need in the community functioning domain. Additionally, for non-Aboriginal men, having a residency condition decreased their likelihood of revocation

for an offence by almost half. For Aboriginal men having a condition to follow treatment or programming decreased their likelihood of revocation for an offence by almost half. Thus, imposing a residency condition for non-Aboriginal men who meet the CCRA requirements for residency appears to be an effective tool in reducing revocations with an offence. For Aboriginal men, it may be that getting treatment while under supervision in the community is beneficial; however, it is important to note the current research examined only whether the condition was applied and did not capture actual treatment participation.

What these Findings Mean for Case Management

First, risk factors having the biggest impact on likelihood of revocation vary among the groups examined in this study. They also vary depending on whether the revocation is for a new offence or for any reason. The following general observations summarize the results of risk factors by group and the implications for community supervision and interventions.

For non-Aboriginal men, those who had the poorest outcomes were young, had indicators of poor institutional adjustment, were released on statutory release, and had low or medium reintegration potential. This group requires the greatest resources and the closest supervision. Based on the findings on dynamic risk areas for non-Aboriginal men interventions that could mitigate the risk of revocation for these men would be those that address substance abuse, employment needs, and areas related to community functioning. Problems related to the community functioning domain are particularly important in increasing risk for revocations with a re-offence. Results suggest that interventions that identify supports that would serve to decrease relapses into substance use (e.g., community programs, AA/NA, urinalysis, avoidance of areas of the community where drug and alcohol abuse is more frequent), promote access to community services; and assist in finding stable, affordable accommodation could be components of an evidenced-based case management strategy.¹⁶

For Aboriginal men, those most likely to have their conditional release revoked were young, had poor institutional adjustment, were released on statutory release, and had medium or high static risk rating. Individuals with these characteristics may benefit from more intensive supervision and interventions. Interventions targeting dynamic needs relating to employment and

¹⁶ Many indicators are included in the community function domain including those related to accommodation, use of community resources and support, financial means, leisure activities, and self-care. It was not possible in this analysis to determine which of these contributed to the relationship of community function domain ratings with the outcome.

attitude could reduce the risk associated with revocation. Interventions focussing on areas related to the community functioning domain may benefit those at risk for revocation for a re-offence.

The risk of revocation among women offenders was highest among those with a CASA-recommendation for substance abuse treatment, those who had been found guilty of an institutional offence, those released from security levels higher than minimum, and those on statutory release. These women require the greatest resources and the closest supervision. With respect to interventions, for non-Aboriginal women, given that those with dynamic needs related to employment or relationships and the family were the most likely to return, interventions targeting these areas could reduce their risk. No dynamic factors were identified that distinguished Aboriginal women who failed on release from those who did not. It is possible that this is due to the relatively small number of women in our sample, or because risk factors were prevalent amongst almost all Aboriginal women, making it difficult to distinguish those at greatest risk of revocation.

A word about the impact of substance abuse on revocation for these groups is warranted. As an individual risk factor, substance abuse was related to revocation for any reason for all groups. However, when risk factors were considered together, substance abuse was no longer associated with failure for Aboriginal men. This should not be interpreted to mean that substance abuse is not a factor that needs to be monitored and mitigated to reduce risk for Aboriginal men offenders. Rather, substance abuse was prevalent among both Aboriginal men who failed and those who did not, thus, it did not distinguish between the two groups once other factors were considered.

It should also be cautioned that although residency conditions appear to be quite effective in reducing recidivism, broadening the use of this condition to include more offenders would not necessarily be effective in further reducing rates. Rather, this finding should be viewed in the following light: when residency conditions are applied to offenders who currently meet the CCRA requirements for residency during conditional release it is associated with a reduction in recidivism.

Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research

Even the best research designs have limitations; issues with the current research are discussed below. First, the variables examined were constrained to what was available in our administrative database. Thus, it is possible that pertinent information was not included in the

current study. Future research should strive to identify additional variables (e.g., mental health of the offender, community support resources used by the offenders, factors associated with Aboriginal social history, etc.) that may influence community outcomes and work to develop a more comprehensive and complete model to assist in release decision-making and community management of offenders. Second, in some cases, the amount of missing data had an impact on our ability to assess reliably the relationship between certain factors and our outcomes. In some cases, the missing data seem to be related to data collection practices such as using a compressed intake assessment; however, in many cases it appears that the information was simply not collected and entered correctly. Addressing this issue of data collection may improve future research endeavours.

Future research may also consider including a larger sample of women in order to estimate the factors related to first revocation of conditional release for an offence. It may also be beneficial to consider looking at the risk factors for those on discretionary and statutory release separately given that factors affecting success in the community may vary based on release type. Finally, a future study that validated these findings would provide greater confidence in the application of the results.

Conclusion

As CSC introduces its Structured Assessment and Intervention Framework (SAIF) initiative - a multi-pronged approach to re-shaping case management practices - the implications of this study, specifically the identification of factors related to poorer outcomes, could be considered in the shaping of policy and the development of training materials for parole officers. Of note, parole officers should be aware that assisting in promoting the successful reintegration of offenders might require a somewhat different emphasis for each of the groups included in the study. Understanding the factors that influence the outcome of community transition can inform the development and refinement of appropriate interventions and case management strategies to facilitate success on release.

References

- Bahr, S. J., Harrie, 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*, 667-692. doi:10.1177/0306624X10383845
- Blomberg, T. G., Bales, W. D., & Piquero, A. R. (2012). Is educational achievement a turning point for incarcerated delinquents across race and sex? *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *41*(2), 202-216.
- Broadhurst, R. G., & Loh, N.S. (1995). Rearrest probabilities for the 1984-1993 apprehended western Australia population: a survival analysis. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, *11*(3), 289-313.
- Bunday, B. D., & Kiri, V. A. (1992). Analysis of censored recidivism data using a proportional hazards-type model. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, *41*, 85-96.
- Cobbina, J. E., Huebner, B. M., & Berg, M. T. (2012). Men, women, and postrelease offending: An examination of the nature of the link between relational ties and recidivism. *Crime and Delinquency*, *58*(3), 331-361.
- Collins, R. E. (2010). The effect of gender on violent and nonviolent recidivism: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *38*(4), 675-684. doi:10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2010.04.041
- Cooke, D. J., & Michie, C. (1998). Predicting recidivism in a Scottish prison sample. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, *4*, 169-211. doi: 10.1080/10683169808520009
- Correctional Service of Canada. (2013). *Report on Plans and Priorities 2013-2014*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Correctional Service of Canada (2012). *Commissioner's directive 705-6: Correctional planning and criminal profile*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Cortoni, F., Hanson, R., & Coache, M. (2010). The recidivism rates of female sexual offenders are low: A meta-analysis. *Sexual Abuse: Journal of Research and Treatment*, *22*(4), 387-401. doi:10.1177/1079063210372142
- Delveaux, K., Heath, S., Flight, J., McKay, M., Rastin, C.J., Allegri, N., Bradley, S., Kambou, H., Horne, S., Aziaba, K., & Di Pasquale, M. (2012). *Evaluation Report: Community Correctional Operations: Chapter 2: Community Supervision Strategies and Staff Safety*. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service Canada.
- Dowden, C., & Andrews, D. A. (2000). Effective correctional treatment and violent re-offending: A meta-analysis. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, *4*, 449-467.
- Dowden, C., & Brown, S. L. (2008). The role of substance abuse factors in predicting recidivism: A meta-analysis. *Crime & Law*, *8*, 243-264. doi: 10.1080/10683160208401818

- Fabelo, T. (2002). The impact of prison education on community reintegration of inmates: The Texas case. *Journal of Correctional Education*, 53(3).
- Freiburger, T. L., & Iannacchione, B. M. (2011). An examination of the effect of imprisonment on recidivism. *Criminal Justice Studies*, 24(4), 369-379.
- Gendreau, P., Little, T., & Goggin, C. (1996). A meta-analysis of the predictors of adult offender recidivism: What works! *Criminology*, 34, 575-607. doi: 10.1111/j.1745-9125.1996.tb01220.x
- Gobeil, R., & Barrett, M.R. (2008). *Rates of recidivism for women offenders*. Correctional Service Canada. Research Report R-192. Ottawa ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Grant, B., & Gillis, C. A. (1999). Day parole outcome, criminal history and other predictors of successful sentence completion. R-83. Ottawa: Correctional Service Canada.
- Gutierrez, L., Wilson, H. A., Rugge, T., & Bonta, J. (2013). The prediction of recidivism with aboriginal offenders: A theoretically informed meta-analysis. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 55(1), 55-99.
- Harlow, C. W. (2003). *Education and correctional populations*. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.
- Hill, G. (1985). Predicting recidivism using institutional measures. *Prediction in criminology*, 96-118.
- Holland, S., Pointon, K., & Ross, S. (2007). *Who returns to prison?: Patterns of recidivism among prisoners released from custody in Victoria in 2002-03*. Research and Evaluation Unit, Corrections Victoria, Department of Justice.
- Johnson, S. (2005). Returning to correctional services after release: A profile of aboriginal and non-aboriginal adults involved in Saskatchewan corrections from 1999/00 to 2003/04. *Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics*, 25(2).
- Jones, C., Hua, J., Donnelly, N., McHutchison, J., and Heggie, K. (2006). *Risk of re-offending among parolees*. Crime and Justice Bulletin no. 91. Sydney: NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research.
- Jones, N. J., Brown, S. L., & Zamble, E. (2010). Predicting criminal recidivism in adult male offenders: Researcher versus parole officer assessment of dynamic risk. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 37, 860- 882. doi: 10.1177/0093854810368924
- Jung, H., Spjeldnes, S., & Yamatani, H. (2010). Recidivism and survival time: Racial disparity among jail ex-inmates. *Social Work Research*, 34, 182-189.
- Kronick, R. F., Lambert, D. E., & Lambert, E. W. (1998). Recidivism among adult parolees: What makes the difference? *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 28(1-2), 61-69.

- Latessa, E. J., & Lowenkamp, C. (2005). What works in reducing recidivism? *The University of St. Thomas Law Journal*, 3, 521-535.
- Liem, M. (2013). Homicide offender recidivism: A review of the literature. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 18(1), 19-25. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2012.08.001
- Lloyd, C.D. & Serin, R.C. (2011). Agency and outcome expectancies for crime desistance: measuring offenders' personal beliefs about change. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, DOI:10.1080/1068316X.2010.511221
- Mackenzie, D. L., Browning, K., Skroban, S. B., & Smith, D. A. (1999). The impact of probation on the criminal activities of offenders. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 36, 423-452. doi: 10.1177/0022427899036004004
- MacKenzie, D. L., & De Li, S. (2002). The impact of formal and informal social controls on the criminal activities of probationers. *Journal of Research in Crime And Delinquency*, 39, 243-276. doi: 10.1177/002242780203900301
- Makarios, M., Steiner, B., & Travis, L. F. (2010). Examining the predictors of recidivism among men and women released from prison in Ohio. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 37, 1377-1391. doi: 10.1177/0093854810382876
- Menzies, R., & Webster, C. D. (1995). Construction and validation of risk assessments in a six-year follow-up of forensic patients: A tridimensional analysis. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 63, 766-778. doi: 10.1037/0022-006X.63.5.766
- Mills, J.F., Anderson, D., & Kroner, D.G. (2004). The antisocial attitudes and associates of sex offenders. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health*, 14, 134-145.
- Mills, J.F., & Kroner, D.G. (2006). Impression management and self-report among violent offenders. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 21, 178-192.
- Mills, J.F., Kroner, D.G., & Forth, A.E. (2002). Measures of Criminal Attitudes and Associates (MCAA): development, factor structure, reliability, and validity. *Assessment*, 9, 240-253.
- Mills, J.F., Kroner, D.G., & Hemmati, T. (2004). The measures of Criminal attitudes and associates (MCAA): The prediction of general and violent recidivism. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 31, 717-733.
- Morgan, K. (1994). Factors associated with probation outcome. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 22, 341-353. doi: 10.1016/0047-2352(94)90081-7
- Nally, J. M., Lockwood, S., Ho, T., & Knutson, K. (2012). Post-release employment and recidivism among different types of offenders with a different level of education: a 5-year follow-up study in Indiana. *Justice Policy Journal*, 9(1), 2-29.
- Nilsson, A. (2003). Living conditions, social exclusion and recidivism among prison inmates. *Journal of Scandinavian Studies in Criminology and Crime Prevention*, 4, 57-83. doi: 10.1080/14043850310005321

- Nuttall, J., Hollmen, L., & Staley, E. M. (2003). The effect of earning a GED on recidivism rates. *Journal of Correctional Education*, 90-94.
- Ostermann, M. (2013). Active supervision and its impact upon parolee recidivism rates. *Crime & Delinquency*, 59(4), 487-509.
- Parole Board of Canada. (2013). 2010-2011 Performance Monitoring Report (PMR). Ottawa: Parole Board of Canada.
- Paolucci, E. O., Violato, C., & Schofield, M. A. (2000). *A review of marital and family variables as they relate to adult criminal recidivism*. National Foundation for Family Research and Education. Retrieved from http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/research/092/r92_e.pdf
- Peersen, M., Sigurdsson, J. F., Gudjonsson, G. H., & Gretarsson, S. J. (2004). Predicting re-offending: A 5-year prospective study of Icelandic prison inmates. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 10, 197-204. doi: 10.1080/10683160310001614789
- Piquero, A. R., Jennings, W. G., Diamond, B., & Reingle, J. M. (2013). A systematic review of age, sex, ethnicity, and race as predictors of violent recidivism. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*. 1-22. doi: 10.1177/0306624X13514733
- Public Safety Canada. (2013). Corrections and conditional release statistical overview: Annual report 2013. Ottawa: Public Works and Government Services Canada.
- Ryan, J. E. (1997). Who gets revoked? A comparison of intensive supervision successes and failures in Vermont. *Crime & Delinquency*, 43, 104-118. doi: 10.1177/0011128703049003002
- 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, 29-42. doi: 10.1177/0306624X07309757
- Sims, B., & Jones, M. (1997). Predicting success or failure on probation: Factors associated with felony probation outcomes. *Crime & Delinquency*, 43, 314-327. doi: 10.1177/0011128797043003005
- Solomon, A. L., Kachnowski, V., & Bhati, A. (2005). *Does parole work? Analyzing the impact of post-prison supervision on rearrest outcomes*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Justice Policy Center.
- Steiner, B., Makarios, M.D., Travis, L. F., & Meade, B. (2012). Examining the effects of community-based sanctions on offender recidivism. *Justice Quarterly*, 29(2), 229-257. doi: [10.1080/07418825.2011.555413](https://doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2011.555413)
- Thompson, B. (1995). *Recidivism in NSW: General study*. Research Publication no. 31. Sydney: NSW Department of Corrective Services.

- Ulmer, J. T. (2001). Intermediate sanctions: A comparative analysis of the probability and severity of recidivism. *Sociological Inquiry*, 71, 164-93. doi: 10.1111/j.1475-682X.2001.tb01107.x
- Vacca, J. S. (2004). Educated prisoners are less likely to return to prison. *Journal of Correctional Education*, 297-305.
- Verbrugge, P., Nunes, K., Johnson, S., & Taylor, K. (2002). Predictors of revocation of conditional release among substance abusing women offenders. R-133. Ottawa: Correctional Service Canada.
- Wilson, D.B., Gallagher, C.A., & MacKenzie, D.L. (2000). A meta-analysis of correction-based education, vocation, and work programs for adult offenders. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 37(4), pp. 347-368.
- Yessine, A.K., & Kroner, D.G. (2004). *Altering antisocial attitudes among federal male offenders on release: A preliminary analysis of the Counter-Point Community Program*. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service Canada.
- Zhang, Y., Zhang, L., & Vaughn, M. S. (2009). Indeterminate and determinate sentencing models: A state-specific analysis of their effects on recidivism. *Crime & Delinquency*, 1-23. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1177/0011128709354047

Appendix A: Additional Analyses

Table A1

Profile of Offenders by Gender and Aboriginal Ancestry.

	Group			
	Non-Aboriginal Men (N=9,622)	Aboriginal Men (N=2,246)	Non-Aboriginal Women (N=587)	Aboriginal Women (N=235)
	%	%	%	%
Intake information				
Demographic				
<i>Age in years (Mean and standard deviation)</i>	38 (12)	34 (10)	37 (11)	33 (9)
Has partner	41	35	29	31
Has at least high school	76	68	78	58
Sentence				
Aggregate sentence				
Indeterminate	1	1	1	1
Three years or less	60	63	72	73
More than three years	39	36	26	26
Offence type				
Violent	49	64	34	60
Non-violent	51	36	66	40
Risk assessment				
Static risk				
High	42	58	23	43
Medium	44	37	49	42
Low	14	5	28	15
Dynamic risk				
High	51	70	36	65
Medium	38	27	40	31
Low	11	2	24	3
Has need in criminogenic domain				
Associates	74	77	75	86
Attitude	76	74	45	46
Community functioning	26	42	49	49
Employment needs	74	90	73	91
Marital or family needs	33	58	58	76
Personal or emotional	72	88	87	95
Substance abuse	64	90	60	93
Reintegration potential				
High	39	15	42	17
Medium	37	39	47	57
Low	24	47	11	26

	Group			
	Non-Aboriginal Men (N=9,622)	Aboriginal Men (N=2,246)	Non-Aboriginal Women (N=587)	Aboriginal Women (N=235)
Intake information	%	%	%	%
Motivation				
High	20	14	62	54
Medium	68	73	36	43
Low	12	12	3	3
Accountability				
High	20	16	46	42
Medium	63	68	48	53
Low	16	17	6	6
Has a responsivity need	14	23	22	29
Engaged in correctional plan	80	79	94	93
First security level				
Maximum	5	6	2	5
Medium	62	77	37	67
Minimum	33	16	61	28

Note. Percentages are based on cases with available information. In no instances did missing data account for more than 20% of the total, with the exception of the criminogenic needs based on the DFIA-R for Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal men.

Table A2

Association between Demographic-, Sentence-, Risk-, and Release-related Factors and First Revocation for Any Reason by Group.

Factors	Group			
	Non-Aboriginal Men	Aboriginal Men	Non-Aboriginal Women	Aboriginal Women
Demographic-related				
Age at release	✓	✓	✓	✓
Has a partner	✓	✓	✗	✗
Has at least high school	✓	✓	✓	✓
Static Risk Factors				
Has scheduled conviction as an adult	✓	✓	✓	✗
Has been supervised in the community previously as an adult	✓	✓	✓	✗
Has previous provincial terms as an adult	✓	✓	✓	✓
Has previous federal terms as an adult	✓	✓	✓	✗
Had failed on previous community supervision as an adult	✓	✓	✓	✗
Had failed on previous conditional release as an adult	✓	✓	✓	✗
Current conviction for scheduled offence	✓	✗	✗	✗
Scheduled convictions as a youth	✓	✓	✓	✓
Has been supervised previously in the community as a youth	✓	✓	✓	✓
Had failed on previous community based supervision as a youth	✓	✓	✓	✓
CASA /W-CASA recommendation for Substance Abuse Treatment	✓	✓	✓	✓
Accepts accountability for actions	✓	✓	✓	✓
Has a responsivity need	✓	✓	✗	✗
Engaged in correctional plan	✓	✓	✗	✓
Sentence-related				
Aggregate sentence	✓	✗	✗	✗
Offence type	✓	✓	✓	✓
Last security level before release	✓	✓	✓	✓
Had institutional offence	✓	✓	✓	✓
Had a transfers to segregation	✓	✓	✓	✓

Factors	Group			
	Non-Aboriginal Men	Aboriginal Men	Non-Aboriginal Women	Aboriginal Women
Release-related information				
Overall static risk	✓	✓	✓	✗
Overall dynamic risk	✓	✓	✓	✓
Has need in criminogenic domain				
Associates	✓	✓	✓	✓
Attitude	✓	✓	✓	✓
Community functioning	✓	✓	✗	✗
Employment needs	✓	✓	✓	✓
Marital or family needs	✓	✓	✓	✗
Personal or emotional	✓	✓	✗	✗
Substance abuse	✓	✓	✓	✓
Reintegration potential	✓	✓	✓	✓
Motivation	✓	✓	✓	✓
Parole conditions – drug- and/or alcohol-related	✓	✓	✓	✓
Parole conditions – avoid certain people and/or places	✓	✗	✓	✗
Parole conditions – follow treatment or intervention	✓	✗	✓	✗
Parole conditions – residency	✓	✓	✓	✓
Parole conditions – other	✓	✓	✓	✗
Reason for first suspension				
Violation or breach of condition	✓	✓	✓	✗
Failure to report or walkway	✓	✓	✓	✓
Criminal or deteriorating behaviour	✓	✓	✓	✓
New charge or offence	✓	✓	✓	✓
Other	✓	✓	✓	✗
Type of release	✓	✓	✓	✓

CASA= Computerized Assessment of Substance Abuse; W-CASA=Women's Computerized Assessment of Substance Abuse. A ✓ indicates the individual factor is associated with revocation of conditional release; an ✗ indicates that there is no association between the factor and experiencing a revocation.

Table A3

Association between Demographic-, Sentence-, Risk , and Release-related Indicators and First Revocation for Any Reason by Group (Hazard Ratios).

Factors	Group			
	Non-Aboriginal Men	Aboriginal Men	Non-Aboriginal Women	Aboriginal Women
Intake factors				
Substance Abuse Intervention – W-CASA recommended			1.87*	2.61***
No Partner vs. has a partner	1.46***	1.23**		
Sentence-related factors				
Sentence of three years or less vs. more than three years	1.26***			
Had an institutional offence	1.44***	1.40***	1.96*	1.75*
Last security level before release				
Medium vs. minimum	1.36***	1.17	1.37	2.25***
Maximum vs. minimum	1.78***	1.54***	3.35**	1.40
Release-related factors				
Age	0.98***	0.98***		
Statutory release	1.17**	1.69***	1.74*	1.54*
Conditions				
Drug- and alcohol-related	1.70***	1.86**	3.72**	
Other	0.92*	0.84**		
Overall static risk rating				
Medium vs. low		1.61**		
High vs. low		1.81*		
Overall dynamic risk rating				
Medium vs. low	1.47***			
High vs. low	1.68***			
Reintegration potential rating				
Low vs. high	2.88***			
Medium vs. high	1.70***			
Has need in criminogenic domain at release				
Employment	1.17**	1.44**	2.18**	
Marital or family needs			1.56*	
Attitude		1.24**		
Substance abuse	1.26***			
Community functioning	1.21***			
Model fit statistics				
Wald chi-square	2054.40***	402.83***	121.46***	48.41***
Degrees of freedom	16	14	8	5
Total N	8431	1922	519	218
N of events	2962	1098	128	120

Table A4

Association between Demographic-, Sentence-, Risk-, and Release-related Factors and First Revocation is for an Offence by Group.

Factors	Group	
	Non-Aboriginal Men	Aboriginal Men
Demographic-related		
Age at release	✓	✓
Has a partner	✓	✓
Has at least high school	✓	✗
Offender intake assessment-related		
Specific Static Risk Factors Items		
Has scheduled conviction as an adult	✓	✗
Has been supervised in the community previously as an adult	✓	✗
Has previous provincial terms as an adult	✓	✓
Has previous federal terms as an adult	✓	✓
Had failure during previous community based supervision as an adult	✓	✗
Had failure on previous conditional release as an adult	✓	✓
Current conviction is for scheduled offence	✓	✓
Scheduled convictions as a youth	✓	✓
Has been supervised previously in the community as a youth	✓	✓
Had failure during previous community based supervision as a youth	✓	✓
CASA/W-CASA recommendation for Substance Abuse Treatment	✓	✓
Accepts accountability for actions	✓	✓
Has a responsibility need	✓	✗
Engaged in correctional plan	✓	✗
Sentence-related		
Aggregate sentence	✓	✗
Offence Type	✗	✗
Last security level before release	✓	✓
Had institutional offence	✓	✓
Had a segregation event	✓	✓

Factors	Group	
	Non-Aboriginal Men	Aboriginal Men
Release-related information		
Overall static risk	✓	✗
Overall criminogenic/dynamic risk	✓	✓
Criminogenic risk domains		
Has associate need	✓	✓
Has attitude need	✓	✓
Has community functioning need	✓	✓
Has employment needs	✓	✓
Has marital or family needs	✓	✗
Has personal or emotional need	✓	✓
Has substance abuse need	✓	✓
Reintegration potential	✓	✓
Motivation to participate in the correctional plan	✓	✓
Parole conditions – drug- and/or alcohol-related	✓	✓
Parole conditions – avoid certain people and/or places	✗	✗
Parole conditions – follow treatment or intervention	✗	✓
Parole conditions – residency	✓	✗
Parole conditions – other	✓	✓
Reason for first suspension		
Violation or breach of condition	✓	✗
Failure to report or walkway	✓	✓
Criminal or deteriorating behaviour	✓	✗
New charge or offence	✓	✓
Other	✓	✗
Type of release	✓	✓

CASA= Computerized Assessment of Substance Abuse; W-CASA=Women's Computerized Assessment of Substance Abuse. A ✓ indicates the individual factor is associated with revocation of conditional release; an ✗ indicates that there is no association between the factor and experiencing a revocation.

Table A5

Multivariate Relationship between Demographic-, Sentence-, Risk-, and Release-related Indicators and First Revocation Of Conditional Release is for an Offence by Group (Hazard Ratios).

Factors	Group	
	Non-Aboriginal Men	Aboriginal Men
Sentence-related factors		
Had an institutional offence	1.28*	1.55**
Release-related factors		
Age	0.97***	0.96***
Statutory release	1.65***	2.33***
Conditions		
Drug-related and Alcohol-related	2.28***	
Residency	0.51***	
Follow treatment or programming		0.59***
Other	0.79*	
Motivation to participating in correctional plan rating		
Low vs. high	1.45*	
Medium vs. high	0.98	
Reintegration potential rating		
Low vs. high	3.63***	
Medium vs. high	2.20***	
Has need in criminogenic domain at release		
Community functioning	1.42***	1.56**
Suspended for a failure to report	6.92***	4.54***
Suspended for breach of condition	1.78***	
Suspended for deteriorating or at risk behaviour	1.70***	
Model fit statistics		
Wald chi-square	661.59***	257.92***
Degrees of freedom	14	6
Total N	8590	2026
N of events	465	230