



DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY

**RESPONSE TO
HOUSE CONCURRENT
RESOLUTION NO. 62**

TWENTY-FIRST LEGISLATURE, 2002

December 2002

**COMPARISON OF RECIDIVISM RATES AND RISK FACTORS BETWEEN
MAINLAND TRANSFERS AND NON-TRANSFERRED INMATES**

**A Study Requested by House Concurrent Resolution No. 62
House of Representatives, Twenty-First Legislature, 2002
State of Hawaii**

**Prepared by the
Department of Public Safety**

December 2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction.....	1
Background.....	2
Selection of Sampled Groups.....	2
Data Sources.....	3
Data Collection.....	3
Measures of Recidivism.....	4
Measures of Risk Factors.....	5
Chi-Square Tests of Association.....	6
Characteristics of Mainland Transfers and Non-transfers.....	6
Recidivism Rates for Mainland Transfers and Non-transfers.....	13
Risk Factors for Mainland Transfers and Non-transfers.....	14
Summary.....	16
Recommendations.....	16

Attachment I: House Concurrent Resolution No. 62

Attachment II: Examples of Guidelines for Transfers at Various Dates

Attachment III: Risk and Needs Assessments

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1: Comparison of Mainland Transfers and Non-transfers by Gender.....	7
Table 2: Comparison of Mainland Transfers and Non-transfers by Ethnic Group or Race	7
Table 3: Comparison of Mainland Transfers and Non-transfers by Legal Status during Incarceration	8
Table 4: Comparison of Mainland Transfers and Non-transfers by Age at Release	9
Table 5: Comparison of Mainland Transfers and Non-transfers by Severity of Offense during Incarceration	10
Table 6: Comparison of Mainland Transfers and Non-transfers by Summary Offense during Incarceration	10
Table 7: Comparison of Mainland Transfers and Non-transfers by Length of Incarceration....	11
Table 8: Comparison of Mainland Transfers and Non-transfers by Release Type.....	12
Table 9: Comparison of Mainland Transfers and Non-transfers by Release Location.....	13
Table 10: Comparison of Recidivism Rates between Mainland Transfers and Non-transfers	14
Table 11: Comparison of Risk Factors between Mainland Transfers and Non-transfers	15

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The principal investigators for this study were Cheryl Rodrigues and Ken Hashi of the Department of Public Safety, Research and Statistics Staff. Advice on data collection and statistical analysis was provided by Janet Davidson of the Department of the Attorney General, Criminal Prevention and Justice Assistance Division, Research and Statistics Branch. Electronic records on arrests and convictions were provided by John Maruyama of the Department of the Attorney General, Hawaii Criminal Justice Data Center. Access to parole case files and interpretations of parole documents were provided by Tommy Johnson, Division Administrator; Max Otani, Branch Administrator; David Chiang, Staff Services Supervisor; and the parole officers and clerical staff of the Hawaii Paroling Authority.

INTRODUCTION

In accordance to House Concurrent Resolution No. 62 passed by the State of Hawaii, House of Representatives, Twenty-First Legislature, 2002 (Attachment I), this report presents the findings of a study to compare the recidivism rates of inmates who were transferred to mainland correctional facilities with similarly situated inmates who remained incarcerated in Hawaii. As requested by the Resolution, the study focused on inmates who have been released or paroled for at least three years.

(In this report, inmates who were transferred to Mainland facilities during their prison sentence are referred to as "mainland transfers". Inmates who remained entirely incarcerated in Hawaii are referred to as "non-transfers".)

The criteria used to select inmates for transfer to the Mainland facilities made it difficult to create a comparable group of inmates who were not selected. In general, the inmates selected for transfer were required to be in good physical and mental health; evaluated to have no or low institutional risk; had three or more years remaining on their minimum sentences; and no pending charges.

Based on three levels of recidivism, the non-transfers had slightly higher recidivism rates than the mainland transfers. These differences in rates for each level of recidivism between the two groups, however, were not statistically significant, i.e. there is a large probability the magnitude of the differences could have occurred largely by chance alone.

This study also compared the two groups on factors used to measure their propensity to recidivate. Based on risk and needs assessments prior to their release, a larger share of mainland transfers had "adequate" human capital than the non-transfers. This measure of human capital was based on their total scores of reasoning and intellectual skills; educational and vocational skills; attitude toward personal change; and emotional stability. The difference between the two groups, moreover, was statistically significant, i.e. there is a small probability that the magnitude of the difference could have occurred largely by chance alone.

Reasons for differences in recidivism and risk factors between the mainland transfers and non-transfers include the selection criteria used in transferring inmates; disparate characteristics and loss of the sampled cases; the units of measures used for recidivism; and suitability of the risk factors to the sampled cases.

Future studies should employ longitudinal research to more effectively collect data. In addition, an inventory and evaluation of inmate programs should be conducted.

BACKGROUND

Number and Location of Transfers in Out-of-State Contracted Facilities

From December 1995, the Department of Public Safety has housed inmates from Hawaii in contracted facilities in various states. Initially, about 300 male inmates or 14.2 percent of the total male prison inmates were transferred to facilities in Texas. By June 30, 1999, 1,095 Hawaii male inmates (38.1 percent of the total male prison inmates); and 83 female inmates (32.2 percent of the total female prison inmates) were housed in out-of-state contracted facilities in Minnesota, Oklahoma, and Tennessee. As of November 11, 2002, 1,238 Hawaii male inmates (36.1 percent of the total male prison inmates) were housed in contracted facilities located in Oklahoma and Arizona; and 64 Hawaii female inmates (14.5 percent of the total female prison inmates) were housed in a contracted facility located in Oklahoma.

Selection of Inmates for Transfers to Out-of-State Contracted Facilities

In general, the inmates selected for transfers to the out-of-state facilities were required to be in good physical and mental health; evaluated to have no or low institutional risk; had three or more years remaining on their minimum sentences; and no pending hearings or charges. The transfers also needed approval by the Department of Public Safety, Health Care Office and the Department of Public Safety, Sex Offender Treatment Program. Inmates were further screened to determine the status of any parole hearing or trial. Notifications were sent to the Hawaii Paroling Authority; Office of the Prosecuting Attorney; Office of the Public Defender; and the Circuit Courts of the Hawaii Judiciary.

The selection criteria, however, were not strictly applied and were changed at various times. For example, inmates with two years remaining on their minimum sentence; or inmates who could not be moved to minimum facilities in Hawaii were later included. Some examples of the criteria used for various dates are listed in Attachment II.

SELECTION OF SAMPLED GROUPS

Based on the criteria in House Concurrent Resolution No. 62, only inmates released until June 30, 1999 were included in this study.

A total of 185 mainland transfers (146 males and 39 females) were released between January 1, 1996 and June 30, 1999. Of this total number, one inmate was released between January 1, 1996 and June 30, 1996. Three inmates were released between July 1, 1996 and June 30, 1997. During Fiscal Years 1998 and Fiscal Years 1999, 37 and 144 mainland transfers were released, respectively. All of these inmates were included as the initial sample for the study.

For the sample of non-transfers, a total of 185 prison inmates (sentenced felons and parole violators; 146 males and 39 females) were selected. Because the largest shares of the mainland transfers were released during Fiscal Year 1998 and Fiscal Year 1999, the sample was selected entirely from these two fiscal years. Of the 890 non-transfers who were released during Fiscal Year 1998, the sample selected for the non-transfers corresponded to the sample selected for the mainland transfers from Fiscal Years 1996 to 1998, i.e. 28 males prison inmates and 13 female prison inmates. Of the 1,039 non-transfers who were released during Fiscal Year 1999, the sample selected for 1999 were 118 male prison inmates and 26 female prison inmates.

More exact matching of the non-transfers to the mainland transfers was not conducted due to limitations on time and staff. Matching inmates based on the selection criteria used for transfers such as their offenses at sentencing, prior criminal history, security classification, history of institutional misconducts, physical and mental health would have required extensive review of inmate case files.

DATA SOURCES

Three sources were used in this study to obtain demographic, incarceration, parole, and rearrest data for each sampled case:

1. Historical electronic inmate records from the Corrections Information System (CIS) of the Department of Public Safety.
2. Active and inactive parole case files from the Hawaii Paroling Authority; and parole records from the electronic data base of the Hawaii Paroling Authority.
3. Printouts in electronic form on arrests and corresponding dispositions from the Offender Based Transaction Statistics \ Comprehensive Criminal History (OBTS\CCH) provided by the Hawaii Criminal Justice Data Center of the Department of the Attorney General.

DATA COLLECTION

Demographic information, prison admission and release dates, legal status (i.e. sentenced felon or parole violator), release type and locations; and charge and sentencing information were initially obtained from historical electronic inmate records of the CIS.

Information for each of the sampled cases were printed on a data collection form. Data on these forms were verified using information from the active and inactive case files at the Hawaii Paroling Authority. In addition, information was collected on the risk and needs assessments and on parole violations and revocations. At the Hawaii Paroling Authority, case files for nine mainland transfers and four non-transfers were not located, even after two to three additional attempts to find them. Consequently, the resulting sample was 176 for mainland transfers and 181 for non-transfers.

Information on rearrests for each sampled case were obtained using printouts of arrests and corresponding dispositions generated from the electronic OBTS\CCH records. For each arrest date, the most serious offense (excluding parole violations) and its corresponding disposition was collected.

MEASURES OF RECIDIVISM

Recidivism was based on all arrests, convictions, parole violations, and revocations which occurred between the inmate's date of release and June 30, 2002. Moreover, three measures or levels of recidivism were used in this study. The first level was based on reports of 1) any arrest for a new offense or 2) parole violation. The second level was based on reports of 1) any conviction for any new offense or 2) parole revocation. The third level was based on reports of 1) any conviction for any felony offense or 2) parole revocation.

A rigorous and scientifically valid measure of recidivism, however, was difficult to construct since the following questions would be difficult to answer:

- "At what stage or involvement with the criminal justice system by an ex-offender does his situation constitute a return to criminal behavior: undetected crime, arrest, interrogation as a suspect, booking, arraignment, court case filing, prosecution, conviction, parole violation involving a new offense, parole violation involving a technical violation, etc.?"
- For what period of time after his release should an ex-offender be monitored to determine if he returns to a mode of criminal behavior, lifetime, one day, one year, two years...?"
- How do we incorporate the number of ex-offenders who commit new offenses, but who are not apprehended, into a "recidivism" rate?"¹

¹ "The Irrelevance of Recidivism to Criminal Justice Evaluation" by Robert Roesch and Lonnie Fouty, Florida Department of Corrections, March 30, 1978.

MEASURES OF RISK FACTORS

Five “risk factors” were used to compare differences between the mainland transfers and non-transfers on their propensity to recidivate prior to release. These factors were based on the same measures in the report entitled Parole Decision Making in Hawaii (August 2001)² used to predict success and failure on parole. Moreover, the five risk factors were derived from determining the inter-correlations of the items in the risk and needs assessments by the Hawaii Paroling Authority (Attachment III). Inter-correlations (factor analysis) of the total 22 items in the assessments resulted in the five factors (groups or clusters) shown in the following table³:

Criminal History	Human Capital	Conventional Life Style	Community and Personal Stability	Alcohol Problem and Self Control
Prior felony convictions	Reasoning and intellectual skills	Suitable companions	Suitability of residence	Alcohol use problem
Prior conviction on selected property offenses	Educational and vocational skills	Drug use and problems or dependence	Number of address changes in year prior to sentenced	Sexual conduct
Prior probation and parole revocations	Attitude toward change	Percent of time employed in year prior to sentence	Marital and family relationships	
Age at first conviction or adjudication	Emotional stability	Quality of employment	Personal financial management skill	

As explained in Parole Decision Making in Hawaii, “for each parolee, a score was computed for each of the five factors by summing the scores on the component items and dividing by the number of items. The list of all the factor scores was then divided at the midpoint, with individual scores falling in either the “low risk” or “high risk” half.”

For this study, the median values of the factor scores were calculated and used to determine high and low levels for “Criminal History” and for “Alcohol Problem and Self Control”; and adequate or inadequate levels for “Human Capital”, “Conventional Life Style”, and “Community and Personal Stability”. Furthermore, only the initial risk and needs assessments usually completed within one year of the date of release were used. Consequently, risk factors were not calculated for inmates with assessments more than one year prior to their release or for inmates with assessments after their release.

² Parole Decision Making in Hawaii (August 2001) by Social Science Research Institute, University of Hawaii at Manoa and the Research and Statistics Branch, Crime Prevention and Justice Assistance Division, Hawaii State Department of the Attorney General.

³ *Ibid.*, page 29.

Risk factors could not be calculated when initial assessments were not completed because pre-sentence investigation reports were waived; for inmates who were released on the expiration date of their minimum sentence; or for inmates who were incarcerated out-of-state and a face-to-face assessment could not be conducted prior to their parole hearing.

Inter-correlations (factor analysis) of the risk and needs assessments for the sampled inmates in this study were not conducted due to limited time available to complete the study. Consequently, the findings on the risk factors presented in this study should be interpreted with caution.

CHI-SQUARE TESTS OF ASSOCIATION

Comparison of recidivism rates and risk factors between the “mainland transfers” and “non-transfers” were based on frequencies depicted in a two-dimensional statistical table and evaluated by using chi-square tests of association. This test of association is used to assess the statistical significance of differences based on the actual frequencies and calculated (expected) frequencies. The larger the difference of the actual frequencies relative to the expected frequencies, the larger the chi-square statistic and the more likely the difference is statistically significant, i.e. only a small the probability the difference would have been produced by chance alone. Generally, the .05 or lower level of significance (i.e. probability) is used to accept the differences as not having occurred largely by chance alone.

CHARACTERISTICS OF MAINLAND TRANSFERS AND NON-TRANSFERS

Comparisons of the sampled inmates of mainland transfers and non-transfers are depicted on the following demographic and institutional characteristics:

- Gender
- Ethnicity or race
- Legal status at release
- Age at release
- Severity of offense during incarceration
- Summary offense during incarceration
- Length of incarceration
- Release type
- Release location

Characteristics of the two groups were similar by gender; ethnicity or race; and age at release. However, compared to the non-transfers, a larger share of the mainland transfers were sentenced felons; convicted for felony A offenses and for violent offenses; incarcerated for two or more years; released to parole supervision; and released to a federal agency or moved out of state.

Males comprised about eight out of ten of the sampled mainland transfers and non-transfers. (Table 1).

TABLE 1
Comparison of Mainland Transfers and Non-transfers
by Gender

Gender	Mainland Transfers		Non-transfers	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total Number Released	176	100.0%	181	100.0%
Male	142	80.7%	145	80.1%
Female	34	19.3%	36	19.9%

By ethnicity and race, a slightly larger share of the mainland transfers were “Other” (21.0 percent) and Caucasian (19.3 percent) than the non-transfers (Table 2). For the non-transfers, a slightly higher proportion were Hawaiian or Part Hawaiian (42.0 percent) than the mainland transfers (39.8 percent).

TABLE 2
Comparison of Mainland Transfers and Non-transfers
by Ethnic Group or Race

Ethnic Group or Race	Mainland Transfers		Non-transfers	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total Number Released	176	100.0%	181	100.0%
Caucasian	34	19.3%	31	17.1%
Hawaiian/Part Hawaiian	70	39.8%	76	42.0%
Asian	21	11.9%	23	12.7%
Other	37	21.0%	30	16.6%
Unknown	14	8.0%	21	11.6%

Most of the mainland transfers were incarcerated as sentenced felons (77.8 percent) compared to the non-transfers (62.4 percent) (Table 3). Conversely, a larger share of the non-transfers were incarcerated as parole violators (37.6 percent) than the mainland transfers (16.5 percent).

TABLE 3
Comparison of Mainland Transfers and Non-transfers
by Legal Status during Incarceration

Legal Status	Mainland Transfers		Non-transfers	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total Number Released	176	100.0%	181	100.0%
Sentenced Felon	137	77.8%	113	62.4%
Parole Violator	29	16.5%	68	37.6%
Other	10	5.7%	0	0.0%

At the time of their release, mainland transfers were generally the same age as the non-transfers (Table 4). The median and mean ages (34.7 years and 33.7 years) for the mainland transfers were slightly lower than the non-transfers (35.1 years and 34.8 years). Slightly larger proportions of the mainland transfers (27.3 percent) were 30 to 34 years old compared to the non-transfers (22.1 percent). Conversely, a slightly higher share of the non-transfers (25.4 percent) were 35 to 39 years old compared to the mainland transfers (20.5 percent).

TABLE 4
Comparison of Mainland Transfers and Non-transfers
by Age at Release

Age Group	Mainland Transfers		Non-transfers	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total Number Released	176	100.0%	181	100.0%
20 years or less	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
20 to 24 years	11	6.3%	17	9.4%
25 to 29 years	37	21.0%	35	19.3%
30 to 34 years	48	27.3%	40	22.1%
35 to 39 years	36	20.5%	46	25.4%
40 to 44 years	27	15.3%	28	15.5%
45 years or older	16	9.1%	15	8.3%
Unknown	1	0.6%	0	0.0%

Average	Mainland Transfers	Non-transfers
Mean age in years	34.7	35.1
Median age in years	33.7	34.8

Compared to the non-transfers, larger percentages of the mainland transfers were incarcerated for Felony A offenses (16.5 percent) and Felony B offenses (44.9 percent) (Table 5). In contrast, about one-half of the non-transfers were incarcerated for Felony C offenses compared to 35.2 percent for the mainland transfers.

TABLE 5
Comparison of Mainland Transfers and Non-transfers
by Severity of Offense During Incarceration

Severity of Offense	Mainland Transfers		Non-transfers	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total Number Released	176	100.0%	181	100.0%
Felony A	29	16.5%	18	9.9%
Felony B	79	44.9%	67	37.0%
Felony C	62	35.2%	93	51.4%
Misdemeanor	4	2.3%	2	1.1%
Unknown	2	1.1%	1	0.6%

By summary offense, a greater share of the mainland inmates (31.8 percent) than non-transfers (23.2 percent) were incarcerated for violent offenses (Table 6). Non-transfers, on the other hand, had a larger percentage who were incarcerated for drug offenses (34.3 percent) than the mainland transfers (27.8 percent).

TABLE 6
Comparison of Mainland Transfers and Non-transfers
by Summary Offense During Incarceration

Summary Offense	Mainland Transfers		Non-transfers	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total Number Released	176	100.0%	181	100.0%
Violent	56	31.8%	42	23.2%
Sex	8	4.5%	6	3.3%
Property	53	30.1%	60	33.1%
Drugs	49	27.8%	62	34.3%
Other	10	5.7%	11	6.1%

The length of incarceration for mainland transfers were longer than the non-transfers. For the mainland transfers, larger shares of them were incarcerated from 24 months to less than 36 months (28.4 percent); and for 36 months or more (39.8 percent) (Table 7). Non-transfers had a larger percentage incarcerated for less than 12 months (30.4 percent) and for 12 months to less than 24 months (35.4 percent). Similarly, the mean and median length of incarceration for the mainland transfers (36.3 months and 30.5 months) were higher than for the non-transfers (23.6 months and 19.1 months).

TABLE 7
Comparison of Mainland Transfers and Non-transfers
by Length of Incarceration

Length of incarceration	Mainland Transfers		Non-transfers	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total Number Released	176	100.0%	181	100.0%
Less than 12 months	9	5.1%	55	30.4%
12 mo.s to less than 24 mo.s	47	26.7%	64	35.4%
24 mo.s to less than 36 mo.s	50	28.4%	29	16.0%
36 months or more	70	39.8%	33	18.2%

Length of Incarceration	Mainland Transfers	Non-transfers
Mean length in months	36.3	23.6
Median length in months	30.5	19.1

The differences in the length of stay reflect the differences in the legal status between the mainland transfers and non-transfers. A greater share of the mainland transfers were sentenced felons compared to the proportion for the non-transfers. These inmates were incarcerated for more than one year. In contrast, the non-transfers had a larger percentage of parole violators who were generally incarcerated for a period ranging from several months to over one year.

A slightly higher share of the mainland transfers (90.9 percent) than non-transfers (86.2 percent) were released and placed under the supervision of the Hawaii Paroling Authority (Table 8). In contrast, the percentage of non-transfers (12.2 percent) who were discharged from parole was greater than the mainland transfers (2.8 percent). In general, inmates are discharged from parole when the date of their maximum sentences have expired; or because of good behavior, illness, or other exceptions.

TABLE 8
Comparison of Mainland Transfers and Non-transfers
by Release Type

Release Type	Mainland Transfers		Non-transfers	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total Number Released	176	100.0%	181	100.0%
Released to Parole Superv.	160	90.9%	156	86.2%
Discharged from Parole	5	2.8%	22	12.2%
Other	11	6.3%	3	1.7%

For the mainland transfers, larger shares were released to a federal agency (13.6 percent) or moved out of state (10.2 percent) than the non-transfers (Table 9). For non-transfers, higher percentages were released to the community or family (72.4 percent); and to treatment programs (19.9 percent.).

TABLE 9
Comparison of Mainland Transfers and Non-transfers
by Release Location

Release Location	Mainland Transfers		Non-transfers	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total Number Released	176	100.0%	181	100.0%
Community or Family	112	63.6%	131	72.4%
Federal Agency	24	13.6%	6	3.3%
Moved Out of State	18	10.2%	2	1.1%
Treatment Programs	21	11.9%	36	19.9%
Other	1	0.6%	1	0.6%
Not Reported	0	0.0%	5	2.8%

Note: Community or Family includes releases to parole, time served, and moved to neighbor islands. Other includes bail or bond releases; and changes to pretrial or sentenced status.

RECIDIVISM RATES FOR MAINLAND TRANSFERS AND NON-TRANSFERS

The recidivism rates were based only on sampled cases who resided in Hawaii and were under parole supervision. Because losses of samples occurred from inmates who died, moved out of state, or were under the custody of a Federal agency, the sample of mainland transfers dropped to 134 and non-transfers fell to 173.

For each level of recidivism, the mainland transfers had lower proportions than the non-transfers (Table 10). For the first level, i.e. any arrest or parole violation, 77.6 percent of the mainland transfers recidivated compared to 80.9 percent of the Hawaii transfers. For the second level, i.e. any conviction or parole revocation, 63.4 percent of the mainland transfers recidivated compared to 67.6 percent of the Hawaii transfers. For the third level, i.e. any felony conviction or parole revocation, 50.0 percent of the mainland transfers recidivated compared to 51.5 percent of the non-transfers. The differences between the two groups for each level, however, were not statistically significant.

TABLE 10
Comparison of Recidivism Rates
Between Mainland Transfers and Non-transfers

	MAINLAND TRANSFERS		HAWAII INMATES	
First Level	134	100.0%	173	100.0%
Yes	104	77.6%	140	80.9%
No	30	22.4%	33	19.1%
Chi-square value:	0.508			
Level of significance :	0.456			
Second Level	134	100.0%	173	100.0%
Yes	85	63.4%	117	67.6%
No	49	36.6%	56	32.4%
Chi-square value:	0.591			
Level of significance :	0.442			
Third Level	134	100.0%	173	100.0%
Yes	67	50.0%	89	51.4%
No	67	50.0%	84	48.6%
Chi-square value:	0.063			
Level of significance :	0.802			

RISK FACTORS FOR MAINLAND TRANSFERS AND NON-TRANSFERS

The total sample used for comparing the propensity to recidivate was based on 85 mainland transfers and 109 non-transfers. Of the five risk factors, only the difference in “human capital” was statistically significant (Table 11). A larger share of the mainland transfers with “adequate” human capital was 72.9 percent compared to the non-transfers with 51.4 percent. The likelihood of such a large difference between the two groups occurring by chance would be less than 3 out of 1000.

TABLE 11
Comparison of Risk Factors
Between Mainland Transfers and Non-transfers

	MAINLAND TRANSFERS		HAWAII INMATES	
Criminal History	85	100.0%	109	100.0%
High	37	43.5%	40	36.7%
Low	48	56.5%	69	63.3%
Chi-square value:	0.931			
Level of significance :	0.335			
Human Capital	85	100.0%	109	100.0%
Inadequate	23	27.1%	53	48.6%
Adequate	62	72.9%	56	51.4%
Chi-square value:	9.320			
Level of significance :	0.002			
Conventional Lifestyle	85	100.0%	109	100.0%
Inadequate	46	54.1%	51	46.8%
Adequate	39	45.9%	58	53.2%
Chi-square value:	1.026			
Level of significance :	0.311			
Community and Personal Stability	85	100.0%	109	100.0%
Inadequate	42	49.4%	49	45.0%
Adequate	43	50.6%	60	55.0%
Chi-square value:	0.381			
Level of significance :	0.537			
Alcohol Problem and Self Control	85	100.0%	109	100.0%
High	32	37.6%	35	32.1%
Low	53	62.4%	74	67.9%
Chi-square value:	0.648			
Level of significance :	0.421			

SUMMARY

Some differences in the recidivism rates between the mainland transfers and non-transfers were found. Proportionally smaller shares of mainland transfers recidivated at each of the three levels. These differences, however, were not statistically significant. By risk factors, a larger share of the mainland transfers had more ‘adequate’ human capital than the non-transfers. The difference, moreover, was statistically significant.

Several possible reasons for differences in recidivism and risk factors between the mainland transfers and non-transfers include:

- Selection criteria used in transferring inmates to contracted out of state facilities
- A larger share of the non-transfers being released as parole violators (37.6 percent) than the mainland transfers (16.5 percent). Prior parole experience was found to be a statistically significant predictor of recidivism⁴.
- Disparities in the loss of the sampled cases due to case files not being located; no assessments; releases to federal agencies; and residency in another state.
- Unit of measures used for recidivism
- Appropriateness of the item scores used to construct the risk factors

RECOMMENDATIONS

Future studies should employ longitudinal research; and include an inventory and evaluation of inmate programs.

A longitudinal study would allow closer monitoring of when, why, and to whom changes in the selection process for transfers occurred. At the same time, more comparable samples can be selected as the selection process occurs. A longitudinal study would distribute the time and effort for collecting demographic, institutional, and release data over a longer period of time; have case files be more accessible; and increase the scope of the information to be collected. Also, this method would track the comparable samples over many points in time and identify changes and trends which can help to better “explain” differences in recidivism and risk factors.

An inventory and (process and outcome) evaluation of inmate programs in mainland facilities and Hawaii facilities should be conducted to determine the quantitative and qualitative differences between the facilities. The information may help to explain some of the differences in recidivism between mainland transfers and non-transfers.

Finally, a study should also be conducted to determine the relationship between the elements that comprise “human capital” and the recidivism rates for non-transfers. Findings that confirm a strong relationship may be used to develop or change programs during incarceration and parole.

⁴ “Survival on Parole”, by Social Science Research Institute, University of Hawaii at Manoa; and the Department of the Attorney General, State of Hawaii

ATTACHMENT II
EXAMPLES OF GUIDELINES FOR TRANSFER AT VARIOUS DATES

For December 1995 transfers

1. Tentative parole date 1999 or later
2. Classified as Close, Medium, or Minimum custody
3. Have no pending litigation requiring return to Hawaii in 3 years
4. Have no extreme medical problems
4. Have no debilitating mental health problems or use of psychotropic medications.
5. Exclude inmates classified as Maximum custody

Inmates should be screened through the Department of Public Safety, Health Care Office; Hawaii Paroling Authority; Hawaii State Judiciary; Office of the Prosecuting Attorney, Office of the Public Defender, and Department of Public Safety, Sex Offender Treatment Program prior to transfer.

For list of inmates to be considered for transfer (needed by February, 12, 1997)

1. Must be classified as medium or close custody.
2. Must have four years or more remaining on their sentences.
3. Inmates with long-term minimum sentences.
4. Inmates with out-of-state detainers. However, do not include inmate with Immigration and Naturalization detainers.
5. Inmates with mental health problems who are stabilized by medication.
6. Inmates whose home-base (family) is on the mainland.
7. Inmates who can be released to the mainland.

For list of inmates to be considered for transfer (requested by May 1, 1997)

1. More than two years before their longest tentative parole date or discharge date.
2. No for pending charges and detainers.
3. No histories of:
 - A. Misconduct's and/or criminal charges involving assaultive behavior.
 - B. Escapes or attempted escapes.
 - C. Sex offenses
4. Medical, mental health and dental clearance.
Note: Mental health clearance to include mental stability and suicidal behavior.
Inmates on psycho tropic medication must be stabilized.
5. Identify balance of maximum sentence.
6. Include any relevant comments regarding the above information. Also include gang information and protective custody needs if you have this information.