

**Kuziemko, I. (2013). How should inmates be released from prison? An assessment of parole versus fixed-sentence regimes. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 128(1), 371-424. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjs052>**

The purpose of this article was to compare the standard parole model with the fixed sentence system in terms of their capacity to reduce the expenses related to imprisonment as well as prospective recidivism among inmates in the future. The study conducted in Georgia, United States, discovered that prisoners after understanding they have a chance to be paroled tend to lower their reoffending risk by behaving better in prison, thereby lowering detention costs, or taking positive steps in preparation for a successful release, thereby decreasing recidivism costs. Offenders eliminated from parole recidivated at higher rates, were involved in more disciplinary infractions and reduced their participation in prison rehabilitation programs. The researchers concluded that abolishing parole would increase prison population and recidivism and associated expenses.

While the article was published in 2013, it is relevant for this debate in that the issue of parole has remained a debate in the current century. It is relevant and accurate in supporting parole as a way of reducing costs and recidivism given the rising cost of crime in Australia. It is purposeful in that it compares the two aspects of the debate. The article is specifically useful in portraying how parole is used as a way of controlling costs associated with incarceration as well as recidivism. In the debate, one can argue while the aim of parole is to provide prisoners with the incentive for rehabilitation, it has a secondary effect of reducing the costs associated with incarceration and recidivism. This strengthens its usefulness in the criminal justice system.

**Wan, W. Y., Poynton, S., & Van Doorn, G. (2014). Parole supervision and reoffending.**

*Trends and Issues in Crime and Criminal Justice*, (485), 1-7.

<https://doi.org/10.3316/informit.636922040153658>

The article sought to determine whether release after completing sentence (unconditional release) increase the risk of recidivism as compared to offenders who are actively supervised (parole supervision). After a study involving 7,494 offenders in New South Wales between 2009 and 2010, the study found that offenders who got parole supervision after release from prison took more time before re-offending, were less likely to engage in new prosecutable offences, and committed fewer crimes than those who were released into the community after serving their sentence in full. It was concluded that an active supervision of paroled offenders can minimise recidivism among parolees, but only if the parole supervision is conducted with the aim of addressing the criminogenic needs and risk factors of the parolee as opposed to simply ensuring the parolee comply with parolee conditions.

The study was conducted recently and is still relevant today because it included a large number of criminals, both on parole and those who had been granted unconditional release. Because it reveals that criminals who are released on parole are more likely to remain out of trouble than those who complete their term in jail, the study is useful in demonstrating the success of parole. This article will be crucial in presenting the point that parole is not the problem, but rather how parole monitoring is carried out, in my next piece. Parole provides better outcomes than serving the entire term and being released unsupervised if the monitoring is effective and the focus is on rehabilitation.

**Angle, R. E. (2014). Build a Mass Movement: Abolish the Probation & Parole Systems to Attack the Foundation of the U.S. Police State. *Race, Gender & Class*, 21(1/2), 236–245. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43496972>**

To support the claim that parole is being utilised as a growth mechanism for the police state, the article covers the history of the United States probation and parole system, as well as its role in imperial policy, in order to provide evidence for the claim. As argued in the article, the incentive for parole and probation has evolved away from rehabilitation and towards the reduction of the expense of jail. Probation and parole, according to the authors, serve as the building blocks for extending the network of incarceration, punishment, information collection, torture, cheap labour, and political pressure that already exists. The police employ parolees as assets in part because the vast majority of all drug arrests entail the use of informants who are pushed into service by the threat of losing their probation or parole status or the promise of lower terms for their own acts.

While the article was published in 2014, it demonstrates how the criminal justices system can use probation and parole as a mechanism to control or achieve its own agenda as opposed to rehabilitation. The use of parole and probation to control costs or using parolees as informants beats the sole purpose of rehabilitating parolees. This article will be vital in my next piece in demonstrating how parole has been misused and no longer serves its purpose offenders should be allowed to serve their time and released unconditionally. It is no secret that the modern parole supervision system focus on compliance as opposed to rehabilitation.

**Robinson, J. A. (2005). The relationship between parole and recidivism in the criminal justice system. *McNair Scholars Journal*, 9(1), 12. Retrieved from <http://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/mcnair/vol9/iss1/12>**

The purpose of this article was to examine the link between parole and recidivism in order to determine whether or not parole is a realistic option for reducing recidivism rates. According to the findings of the review, there is a positive association between parole and recidivism, with the higher the number of criminals released on parole, the higher the recidivism rate. The premise was that, if released on parole, the vast majority of criminals would be confronted with unemployment, physical disease, homelessness, mental health issues, and drug abuse. Frustration, despair, emotional issues, concern, and stress are all elements that lead to recidivism as well as other negative emotions. The majority of the issues experienced by criminals who have just been released from jail will result in concern and tension, which will create the ideal environment for recidivism.

While this article is old, its relevance for this debate is unquestionable. It is accurate in its demonstration of conditions which influence recidivism. The purpose of the article is well revealed and it informs about relationship between parole and recidivism and goes beyond to explain factors which influence this relationship. In my next piece, this article will be vital in expounding on the limitations of parole. As per results, parole does not serve any purpose since the challenges parolees face as the same they face when released unconditionally. Parole does not reduce recidivism and thus there is no difference between getting parole and serving full term when it comes to recidivism.