

# INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY: APPLIED BUSINESS AND EDUCATION RESEARCH

2023, Vol. 4, No. 10, 3787 – 3799

<http://dx.doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.04.10.29>

---

## Research Article

### Measuring Recidivism Rate: Its Predictive Variables and Antecedents

Maria Diana B. Delfin<sup>1\*</sup>, Wildredo D. Dalugdog<sup>2</sup>, Alrien F. Dausan<sup>1</sup>, Elizabeth S. Villa-Buena<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>College of Criminal Justice Education – Graduate Studies, De La Salle University – Dasmaringas (DLSU-D), 4114, Philippines

<sup>2</sup>College of Criminal Justice Education, Laguna State Polytechnic University, 4019, Philippines

---

#### Article history:

Submission June 2023

Revised October 2023

Accepted October 2023

#### \*Corresponding author:

E-mail:

[ariamandie23@gmail.com](mailto:ariamandie23@gmail.com)

#### ABSTRACT

This study examined the recidivism rate at the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology – National Capital Region (BJMP-NCR), Philippines, from 2020 to 2022 based on predictive variables and antecedents of recidivism. The results revealed that young individuals; males; married; Person Deprived of Liberty (PDL) with drug cases, leading to death or intending to cause death, and acts involving fraud and deception; and those having shorter stays in prison tend to recidivate more. Likewise, the pattern of recidivism in the Metro Manila District Jail (MMDJ) from 2020 to 2022 was affected by the existence of the COVID-19 pandemic. In conclusion, both predictive variables and antecedents of recidivism show no significant association with the pattern of recidivism.

**Keywords:** *Incarceration, Person deprived of liberty, Recidivists, Recidivism*

---

#### Introduction

Every human being is believed to be capable of remorse and repentance (Zhong et al., 2014). Once committed behind bars, a person is released and reintegrated into the community after being rehabilitated, reformed, and considered a law-abiding citizen (Sanyal, 2010). Imprisonment is utilized to correct one's wrongful act while setting examples and deterring would-be criminals (Galbiati & Drago, 2012). Albeit, some of them if not everyone, are returning to the place of confinement

and being involved in recidivism (James, 2015). Recidivism is the act of a formerly criminal turning to criminal behavior again; in which re-apprehension, new trial, and re-incarceration take place (Chenane et al., 2015). Revised Penal Code (RPC) of the Philippines clearly manifests that a certain person is said to be a recidivist when on separate occasions, he is convicted of two offenses under the same title of the code (Par. 9 Art. 14, RPC).

Recidivism can be linked to the demographic profiles of PDL like age, gender, marital

---

#### How to cite:

Delfin, M. D. B., Dalugdog, W. D., Dausan, A. F., & Villa-Buena, E. S. (2023). Measuring Recidivism Rate: Its Predictive Variables and Antecedents. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 4(10), 3787 – 3799. doi: 10.11594/ijmaber.04.10.29

status, length of incarceration, and nature of their offense. Nagin et al., (2009) have mentioned the age-crime relationship to prove or disprove inverse and nonlinear association of the same. Many theorists also used continuous variables in assessing recidivism regarding age groupings (Huebner & Berg, 2009). Chances of recidivism can also be directly bonded to the gender of an offender, others are claiming males have high tendencies toward recidivism rather than females (McCoy & Miller, 2013). Universally, there are more unmarried offenders than married offenders incarcerated in places of confinement, thus marital status is considered as a predictor of crime and even cases of recidivism (Nwankwo et al., 2018). The crime they committed before can also be a compelling factor in reoffending as they may just barely forget the mistake or make it a habit if not track of life (Hester, 2018). Finally, the length of their stay in prison can also be a predicting factor, that instead of being rehabilitated, they acquire more skills and are more exposed to other criminals (Bayer et al., 2007).

In 2012, the Bureau of Correction (BuCor) one of the penitentiaries in the Philippines reported that there is a 20% increase in recidivism among Filipinos who were deprived of liberty and that it continually escalates until today (Co et al., 2016). The country's incarceration facilities' occupancy level based on official capacity is reportedly 463.6%, albeit, the significance of reporting re-offending among PDLs is missed as there is no available statistical data on said recidivism in the Philippines (Flores-Barolo & Vicente, 2019).

Measuring recidivism is looking through the re-arrest and reconviction rate of prisoners recommitted to jail. As reflected in the literature above, the theorist and researchers studied antecedents of recidivism separately and failed to analyze the same with a bigger picture. Prison length effects on recidivism are not clearly shown in past studies (Rhodes et al., 2018) and most recidivism research is conducted and focused on a limited predictor (Brame et al., 2018). Currently, there is no recorded study in the Philippines reporting on the recidivism rate according to static and dynamic influences or a wide array of predictive variables and antecedents of recidivism. Co et al.

(2016) admitted that the result of their study is limited as there are only 4 respondents in the study, and that the future researcher should include different factors since a single factor does not determine the reason for recidivism. Moreover, future researchers in the Philippines are challenged to specify variables that are relevant to recidivism to have a sound study (Co et al., 2016).

With the foregoing premises, this study aims to describe and correlate the age, gender, marital status, length of incarceration, and nature of the offense of recidivists. Recidivism antecedents were also subjected to being linked to the current recidivism rate. Instead of focusing solely on violent and non-violent crime categories, the PDLs' crime commission was organized according to Philippine crime classifications. Additionally, the rate of recidivism before and during the COVID-19 pandemic was observed.

## **Methods**

In this study, the quantitative descriptive research design was utilized. The Bureau of Jail Management and Penology – National Capital Region (BJMP-NCR) is the research locale of this study. Specifically, the MMDJ Annex 1, MMDJ Annex 2, MMDJ Annex 4, MMDJ Annex 5, and MMDJ Annex 6, except for the MMDJ Annex 3 which is no longer operational. Said annexes were all located inside Camp Bagong Diwa, Lower Bicutan, Taguig, Philippines. The study utilized a survey questionnaire adapted from existing literature and results of previous studies that composed of two parts: Part I is about the respondents' age, sex, marital status, nature of the offense, and length of incarceration, and Part II is about the antecedents of recidivism which includes familial structure, cognitive and psychological factors, environmental and institutional factors, and other factors related to prior criminal offenses. The self-made survey questionnaire was content validated by three (3) experts in the field of the study before being pilot tested with 35 respondents to ensure internal consistency and reliability. Using the inter-reliability test, the Cronbach alpha of 35 respondents is .769, describing the above acceptability of the instrument.

This study was conducted involving 70 recidivists from 2020-2022. As most studies use unified metrics in recidivism consensus, a 3-year analysis as a cohort-based methodology was used in this study that can be supported by substantial data set from the jail. The researchers asked for the permission of the Head of the BJMP-NCRO through a formal letter for the conduct of the study. Subsequently, hard copies of the survey questionnaire were distributed personally to 70 recidivists by the researchers through the help of the jail officers, to measure the predictive variables and antecedents of recidivism. The Frequency and Percentage distribution were used to summarize the recidivism predictive variables and antecedents. Pearson Chi-square was used to test the association of predictive variables and recidivism rate. Meanwhile, Pearson Coefficient Correlation was used to examine the relationship between recidivism and its antecedents. Furthermore, the antecedents of recidivism were interpreted further using binary logistic regression analysis to predict their relationship with the dependent variable, which is the recidivism rate.

To ensure that the study is not detrimental to the PDLs' well-being, a clearance, and informed consent has been secured both from the Head of the BJMP and the respondents, respectively. All data were treated privately with respect to anonymity and confidentiality while the identity of the PDLs was masked.

## Result and Discussion

Table 1 describes the respondents' profile variables. It was observed that there are three (3) respondents between the ages of 18 and 22, implying that the youngest recidivist is 20 years old, while the oldest is 63 years old. This result affirms that younger adults have greater chances of rearrests than older adults (Rakes et al., 2018), and confirmed by Zgoba and Salerno (2017) that younger offenders are mostly reincarcerated than older ones.

As to sex, there are generally male respondents ( $f=60$ ,  $\%=85.7$ ), with smaller samples for females ( $f=10$ ,  $\%=14.3$ ). Thus, this means, that out of 70 respondents, males are more likely to recidivate than females. James (2015) affirms that the disparity between genders among offenders and re-offenders may be due to the fact

that men are less effective at forming support mechanisms than women.

As to marital status, the majority are single (58, 82.9%), followed by married (8, 11.4%), and widower with two (2.9%) respondents. The rest of the categories such as separated and annulled gained one (1) response (1.4%). Wilson (1997) asserted that unmarried offenders are greater in number the married offenders, hence, marital status is considered to be a predictor of recidivism.

Concerning the nature of the offense, mostly fall in the *acts involving controlled drugs or other psychoactive substances* ( $f=55$ ,  $\%=78.6$ ) which describe the crime related to the *violation of R.A. 9165*, followed by *acts involving or intended to cause death* ( $f=5$ ,  $\%=7.1$ ) which include *murder, homicide, parricide, infanticide, and other related crime of the same nature. Acts involving fraud, deception, or corruption* has four (4) responses (5.7%) that describe cases about *estafa, corruption, bouncing check, illegal recruitment, etc.* Succeeding is the *acts against property* only with three (3) responses (4.3 %) which involves *theft, qualified theft, and malicious mischief, among others.* Other *criminal acts not elsewhere as classified* such as *kidnapping, arson, carnapping, illegal possession of firearms, etc.* have two (2) responses or 2.9%. Lastly, *acts against property involving violence or threat against a person that concerns robbery, and other similar acts* have one (1) response or 1.4%. Meanwhile, other categories under the nature of the offense, including *acts causing harm or intending to cause harm to the person;*

*injurious acts of a sexual nature, acts against public order, authority, and provisions of the State; acts against public safety and state of security; and acts against the natural environment* has no response.

As to the length of incarceration of the offenders based on their 1<sup>st</sup> offense, a large number in the category of 6 months & 1 day to 6 years (35, 50.0%), seconded by 1 month & 1 day to 6 months (23, 32.9%) were recorded. Meanwhile, less than a month received six (6) responses, or 8.6%, and three (3) responses (4.3%) for both categories, 6 years & 1 day to 12 years, and 12 years & 1 day to 20 years. It can also be noted that there is no response for

the 20 years and 1 day to 40 years, as well as 40 years and 1 day and above. 6 months 1 day to 6 years otherwise garnered the highest response as most of the respondents were violator of Sec. 15 of the R.A. 9165 or use of illegal drugs. Some

studies suggested that an initial greater punishment will sow fear or deterrence to the individual himself and to the would-be criminal (Roach & Schanzenback, 2015).

*Table 1. Profile of Recidivist*

<b>Profile Variables</b>	<b>Frequency (N=70)</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>Age</b>		
<i>28-32 years old</i>	14	20.0
<i>33-37 years old</i>	7	10.0
<i>38-42 years old</i>	13	18.6
<i>43-47 years old</i>	15	21.4
<i>48-52 years old</i>	9	12.9
<i>53-57 years old</i>	1	1.4
<i>58-62 years old</i>	3	4.3
<i>63 years old and above</i>	1	1.4
<b>Gender</b>		
<i>Male</i>	60	85.7
<i>Female</i>	10	14.3
<b>Marital Status</b>		
<i>Single</i>	58	82.9
<i>Married</i>	8	11.4
<i>Widower</i>	2	2.9
<i>Separated</i>	1	1.4
<i>Annulled</i>	1	1.4
<b>Nature of Offense</b>		
<i>Acts involving controlled drugs or other psychoactive substances</i>	55	78.6
<i>Acts involving or intended to cause death</i>	4	7.1
<i>Acts involving fraud, deception or corruption</i>	3	5.7
<i>Acts against property only</i>	2	4.3
<i>Other criminal acts not elsewhere as classified</i>	1	2.9
<i>Acts against property involving violence or threat against a person</i>	0	1.4
<i>Acts causing harm or intending to cause harm to the person</i>	0	0.0
<i>Injurious acts of a sexual nature</i>	0	0.0
<i>Acts against public order, authority and provisions of the State</i>	0	0.0
<i>Acts against public safety and state of security</i>	0	0.0
<i>Acts against the natural environment</i>	0	0.0
<b>Length of Incarceration</b>		
<i>Less than a month</i>	6	8.6
<i>1 month &amp; 1 day to 6 months</i>	23	32.9
<i>6 months &amp; 1 day to 6 years</i>	35	50.0
<i>6 year &amp; 1 day to 12 years</i>	3	4.3
<i>12 years &amp; 1 day to 20 years</i>	3	4.3
<i>20 years &amp; 1 day to 40 years</i>	6	8.6
<i>40 years &amp; above</i>	0	0

Table 2 shows the familial structure of the antecedent of recidivism among respondents. Using the frequency-based score, the following responded yes respectively: *I don't live with my parents/family* (26 or 37.1%), *I am/was cared for by my foster parents* (24 or 34.3%), *My parents are separated* (18 or 25.7%), *I am not supervised/cared by my parents/family* (12 or 17.1%), *My parents/siblings is/are in trouble with the law* (10 or 14.3%), *My parents/family has a recent history of drug abuse* (62 or 88.6%), and *I have a conflict with my family* (4 or 5.7%).

Family models and relationships have a significant impact on the emergence of criminal behavior in an individual, as household addictions such as alcohol, drugs, and gambling, among others (Wright & Wright, 1993). Wright

& Wright also noted that entry into the criminal way of young individuals and recidivism in the future were results of dysfunctional family relationships. Since 26 out of 70 recidivists don't live with their family, 24 out of 70 were cared for by foster parents/family only, 18 out of 70 has broken family, and 12 out of 70 were not supervised by their family, it can be assumed that structural family therapy is not feasible. That is, when the family members respect the structure of the family, guidance over each member will probably work well (Yarhouse & Sells 2017). Families' connection with those individuals who were incarcerated has a significant effect to reduce recidivism (Friedmann, 2014).

Table 2. Familial Structure as Antecedent of Recidivism

Familial Structure	Frequency (N=70)		Percent	Rank
	No	Yes		
1. <i>I don't live with my parents/family.</i>	44	26	37.1	1
2. <i>I am/was cared for by my foster parents.</i>	46	24	34.3	2
3. <i>My parents are separated.</i>	52	18	25.7	3
4. <i>I am not supervised/cared for by my parents/family.</i>	58	12	17.1	4
5. <i>My parents/siblings is/are in trouble with the law.</i>	60	10	14.3	5
6. <i>My parents/family has a recent history of drug abuse.</i>	62	8	11.4	6
7. <i>I have a conflict with my family.</i>	66	4	5.7	7

Table 3 shows the cognitive and psychological factors as antecedents of recidivism among respondents. Talled responses of the recidivists for yes underscores the following: *I am experiencing depression* (48 or 68.6%), *I am experiencing anxiety* (32 or 45.7%), *I have low self-esteem* (22 or 31.4%), *I am thinking differently* (12 or 17.1%), *I find learning very difficult* (11 or 15.7%), *I can't read and write* (7 or 10.0%), *I am experiencing hallucinations* (4 or 5.7%), and *I attempted suicide* (3 or 4.3%). This can be evident from a systematic review and meta-

regression analysis in 24 countries, wherein it was found that 10.2 % of male PDLs have major depression, while 14.1% of female PDLs have the said depression (Welu et al., 2021). Emotional responses to places of confinement, such as anger and hostility could be a significant antecedent of recidivism among offenders. According to the General Strain Theory, a crime commission can serve as a coping mechanism for one individual to a certain strain (Shaw, 2020).

Table 3. Cognitive and Psychological Factors as Antecedent of Recidivism

Familial Structure	Frequency (N=70)		Percent	Rank
	No	Yes		
1. <i>I am experiencing depression.</i>	22	48	68.6	1
2. <i>I am experiencing anxiety.</i>	38	32	45.7	2
3. <i>I have low self-esteem.</i>	48	22	31.4	3

Familial Structure	Frequency (N=70)		Percent	Rank
	No	Yes		
4. <i>I am thinking differently.</i>	58	12	17.1	4
5. <i>I find learning very difficult.</i>	59	11	15.7	5
6. <i>I can't read and write.</i>	63	7	10.0	6
7. <i>I am experiencing hallucinations.</i>	66	4	5.7	7
8. <i>I attempted suicide</i>	67	3	4.3	8

Table 4 shows the cognitive and psychological factors as antecedents of recidivism. The tallied yes responses of the recidivists underscore the following in order: *I have delinquent/law violator friends* (56 or 80.0%), *I am a drug user* (55 or 78.6%), *I have low income* (49 or 70.0%), *I have a low level of education* (36 or 51.4%), *I don't have a job* (26 or 37.1%), *I am an alcoholic* (23 or 32.9%), *I have conduct disorder* (22 or 31.4%), *I have an aggressive behavior* (18 or 25.7%), both items *I have a pre-adult prior arrest like juvenile delinquency* and *I have an anti-social attitudes/lifestyle towards education or work* (11 or 15.7%), *I have behavioral problems at home/school/work* (7 or 10.0%), *I am homeless* (6 or 8.6%), and *I have behavioral problem/s* (4 or 5.7%).

Having delinquent friends in places of confinement may entail a high probability of recidivism. Offenders inside the prison are also prone to developing peers along with co-offenders and may show a high probability of recidivism if said association is maintained in their post-release (Vries & Liem, 2011). Moreover, 56 out of 70 recidivists responded that they are drug users, evident that drug addiction/dependence has an impact on recidivism.

Flores-Barolo & Vicente (2019) asserted that a well-managed rehabilitative program by professionally qualified staff may have a major impact on reducing drug use among PDLs and even after their release.

Meanwhile, low income, low level of education, and unemployment ranked third, fourth, and fifth, respectively as antecedents of recidivism. It can be noted that the trio was closely related to each other, as one may have low income or be unemployed if he has a low level of education, or barred due to the stigma of being incarcerated before. Unemployment and low income were directly associated with human capital (Western & Sirois, 2019). Western and Sirois also noted that incarcerated minorities have labor market disadvantages since they are linked to criminal stigma. Given that a recidivist has a low level of education, and has a criminal stigma, it is then assumed that he may land a low-paying job or may not land a job at all, and would rely on illegal sources of income instead.

As a matter of fact, unemployment and underemployment have repeatedly been confirmed by various scholars to have a direct association with recidivism rather than desistance from crime (Huebner & Berg, 2009).

Table 4. Behavioral and Environmental Factors as Antecedent of Recidivism

Familial Structure	Frequency (N=70)		Percent	Rank
	No	Yes		
1. <i>I have delinquent/law violator friends.</i>	14	56	80.0	1
2. <i>I am a drug user.</i>	15	55	78.6	2
3. <i>I have a low income.</i>	21	49	70.0	3
4. <i>I have a low level of education.</i>	34	36	51.4	4
5. <i>I don't have a job.</i>	44	26	37.1	5
6. <i>I am an alcoholic.</i>	47	23	32.9	6
7. <i>I have conduct disorder.</i>	48	22	31.4	7
8. <i>I have aggressive behavior.</i>	52	18	25.7	8
9. <i>I have a pre-adult prior arrest (juvenile delinquency)</i>	59	11	15.7	9.5
	59	11	15.7	9.5

Familial Structure	Frequency (N=70)		Percent	Rank
	No	Yes		
10. I have an anti-social attitude/lifestyle towards education or work.	63	7	10.0	11
11. I have behavioral problems at home/school/work.	64	6	8.6	12
12. I am homeless.	66	4	5.7	13
13. I have behavioral problem/s.				

Table 5 shows the cognitive and psychological factors as antecedents of recidivism. It can be noted that the recidivists' tallied response for yes underscores the following: *I associated with other offenders before* (43 or 61.4%), *I am convicted with my prior case before* (37 or 47.1%), *I am convicted with the same offense as before* (28 or 40.0%), *I am involved in prison misconducts before* (14 or 20.0%), and *I am once granted with pardon/parole/probation* (13 or 18.6%).

It can be noted that prison association was discussed earlier as one of the predictors of recidivism falling under the length of incarceration. Meantime, said prison association ranked 1<sup>st</sup> as the antecedent of recidivism with 43 responses. Bayer et al. (2007) found strong evidence of peer effects on burglary, drug offenses, assault, sex offenses, and larceny, and that peer influence draw a greater impact on individuals who had the same crime category experience. Moreover, exposure to peers with a history of committing a particular offense may mark a greater propensity that an individual who already committed said crime, may involve in

recidivism (Bayer et al., 2007). Moreover, based on the results, out of 70 respondents, 37 were convicted of their prior offense, and it can be assumed that 33 respondents were not convicted of their 1<sup>st</sup> offense. Albeit said respondents were considered recidivists based on the generic meaning of recidivism, where formerly incarcerated individual reverted to criminal behavior in which re-apprehension, a new trial, and re-incarceration takes place (Chenane et al., 2015).

Meanwhile, 28 out of 70 respondents claimed that they were convicted of the same offense as before. Most of the inmates considered not giving up on their criminal career/behavior after being released from prison (Svönudóttir, 2015). In the qualitative study of Svönudóttir, it was revealed that most of the PDLs wouldn't want to stay away from their crime since they perceived that there is more gain (crime proceeds) than cost (imprisonment/punishment), while others believed that they developed more connection to the underworld and that their operation once they got released will be more intensified.

Table 5. Prior to Criminal Offense as Antecedent of Recidivism

Familial Structure	Frequency (N=70)		Percent	Rank
	No	Yes		
1. I associated with other offenders before.	27	43	61.4	1
2. I am convicted with my prior case before.	33	37	47.1	2
3. I am convicted of the same offense as before.	42	28	40.0	3
4. I am involved in prison misconduct.	56	14	20.0	4
5. I am once granted pardon/parole/probation.	57	13	18.6	5

Table 6 illustrates the pattern of recidivism from 2020 to 2022 among respondents with the frequency count based on the data provided by the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology (BJMP) National Capital Region (NCR). On top of the year of pattern of recidivism is the year

2022 with 29 out of 70 respondents (41.4%), followed by 2021 with 23 out of 70 respondents (32.9%), and 2020 with 18 respondents (25.7%). Given the statistics, it can be noted that the increase in recidivism patterns can be attributed to the existing pandemic. It is a fact

that due to the Corona Virus Disease-19 (COVID-19); the crime rate started to rise and even hits its peak which can be associated with *crimes against R.A. 9165, acts involving or intended to cause death, and acts involving fraud, deception, among others (See Table 1).*

In early 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic hit the world leading to city lockdowns, stay-at-home orders or quarantines, and commercial mass closings which became the “new normal”. With said mandates, there have been major deviations in routine activity, mental and emotional health, and financial stabilities of many

people, which offer opportunities for large-scale criminology studies (Esposito & King, 2021). COVID-19 lockdowns escalate loneliness, depression, unemployment, financial non-stability, alcohol/drug addiction, and poverty, among others (Wake & Kandula, 2022). Based on Table 6, in the span of 3 years, about 15.7% was already added to the recidivism rate from 2020 to 2022. Illegal drug addiction/dependence as shown in *Table 1* undeniably has a great impact on said statistics, since 55 out of 70 respondents were R.A. 9165 violators.

Table 6. Pattern of Recidivism from 2020 to 2022

Pattern of Recidivism	Frequency (N=70)	Percent
2022	29	41.4
2021	23	32.9
2020	18	25.7

Table 7 shows the age group by pattern of recidivism, and it can be noted that the result was statistically not significant,  $\chi^2(18)=12.313, p<.831$ . The researchers can accept the null hypothesis and confirm that there is no significant association between recidivism and age group. Although Table 1 strongly

suggests that 47 and above were less likely to recidivate, the age group of recidivists incarcerated in MMDJ from 2020 to 2022 cannot be directly associated with a pattern of recidivism from 2020 to 2022. Age-crime relationship neither proved nor disproved inverse and nonlinear association of the same (Nagin et al, 2009).

Table 7. Frequencies of Age Group by Pattern of Recidivism

Age	Year of Recidivism			Total	
	2020	2021	2022		
18-22 years old	Count	0	1	2	3
	Expected Count	.8	1.0	1.2	3.0
23-27 years old	Count	2	0	2	4
	Expected Count	1.0	1.3	1.7	4.0
28-32 years old	Count	6	4	4	14
	Expected Count	3.6	4.6	5.8	14.0
33-37 years old	Count	1	2	4	7
	Expected Count	1.8	2.3	2.9	7.0
38-42 years old	Count	3	5	5	13
	Expected Count	3.3	4.3	5.4	13.0
43-47 years old	Count	2	6	7	15
	Expected Count	3.9	4.9	6.2	15.0
48-52 years old	Count	3	4	2	9
	Expected Count	2.3	3.0	3.7	9.0
53-57 years old	Count	0	0	1	1
	Expected Count	.3	.3	.4	1.0
58-62 years old	Count	1	1	1	3
	Expected Count	.8	1.0	1.2	3.0

Age		Year of Recidivism			Total
		2020	2021	2022	
63 years old and above	Count	0	0	1	1
	Expected Count	.3	.3	.4	1.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>70</b>
	<b>Expected Count</b>	<b>18.0</b>	<b>23.0</b>	<b>29.0</b>	<b>70.0</b>

Table 8 shows the sex by pattern of recidivism, the computed value depicts non-significance having the  $\chi^2(2)=5.622, p<.060$ . This means that the researchers may accept the null hypothesis and confirm that there is no

significant association between recidivism and sex. Imprisonment has a similar effect on males and females, although drug recidivism among males tends to escalate more (Mears et al., 2012).

Table 8. Frequencies of Sex by Pattern of Recidivism

Sex		Year of Recidivism			Total
		2020	2021	2022	
Male	Count	18	17	25	60
	Expected Count	15.4	19.7	24.85	60.0
Female	Count	0	6	4	10
	Expected Count	2.6	3.3	4.1	10.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>70</b>
	<b>Expected Count</b>	<b>18.0</b>	<b>23.0</b>	<b>29.0</b>	<b>70.0</b>

Table 9 shows the marital status by the pattern of recidivism, wherein the computed value is statistically not significant,  $\chi^2(8)=4.260, p<.833$ . This allows the researchers to accept the null hypothesis and confirms that there is no significant association between recidivism and marital status. Many studies

suggest that marriage reduces recidivism among men, albeit, such findings only represent the average effect of different types of marriages in limited data (Andersen et al., 2015). Andersen et al. support said assumption by asserting that recidivism is not affected by marriage, but the type of marriage instead.

Table 9. Frequencies of Marital Statu by Pattern of Recidivism

Age		Year of Recidivism			Total
		2020	2021	2022	
Single	Count	15	20	23	58
	Expected Count	14.9	19.1	24.0	58.0
Married	Count	3	2	3	8
	Expected Count	2.1	2.6	3.3	8.0
Separated	Count	0	0	1	1
	Expected Count	.3	.3	.4	1.0
Annulled	Count	0	0	1	1
	Expected Count	.3	.3	.4	1.0
Widower	Count	0	1	1	2
	Expected Count	.5	.7	.8	2.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>70</b>
	<b>Expected Count</b>	<b>18.0</b>	<b>23.0</b>	<b>29.0</b>	<b>70.0</b>

Table 10 shows the association of the nature of offense by pattern of recidivism, the result was statistically not significant,  $\chi^2(10)=7.800, p<.648$ . Thereby, the researchers accepted the null hypothesis and affirm that there is no significant association between recidivism and the nature of the offense. As discussed earlier, the COVID-19 pandemic had a great impact on the recidivism rate in MMDJ

from 2020-2022. Violation of R.A. 9165 tends to fluctuate during the said pandemic, while other crime classifications such as crimes against persons, and property, among others, declined due to lockdowns, limitations, and stay-at-home restrictions. Thus, the nature of the offense can't be directly associated with the pattern of recidivism in MMDJ from 2020 to 2022.

Table 10. Frequencies of Nature of Offense by Pattern of Recidivism

Nature of Offense		Year of Recidivism			Total
		2020	2021	2022	
Acts involving or intended to cause death	Count	2	0	3	5
	Expected Count	1.3	1.6	2.1	5.0
Acts against property involving violence or threat against a person	Count	1	0	0	1
	Expected Count	.3	.3	.4	1.0
Acts against property only	Count	0	1	2	3
	Expected Count	.8	1.0	1.2	3.0
Acts involving controlled drugs or other psychoactive substances	Count	14	20	21	55
	Expected Count	14.1	18.1	22.8	55.0
Acts involving fraud, deception, or corruption	Count	1	1	1	4
	Expected Count	1.0	1.3	.8	4.0
Other criminal acts not elsewhere as classified	Count	0	1	1	2
	Expected Count	.5	.7	.8	2.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>70</b>
	<b>Expected Count</b>	<b>18.0</b>	<b>23.0</b>	<b>29.0</b>	<b>70.0</b>

Table 11 shows the length of incarceration by pattern of recidivism, and further revealed that the result was statistically not significant,  $\chi^2(8)=6.733, p<.566$ . This allows the researchers to accept the null hypothesis and confirm that there is no significant association between recidivism and length of incarceration. Incar-

ceration of 60 months or less has no criminogenic effect (United States Sentencing Commission, 2019). Given that most of the respondents were incarcerated at the BJMP for about 3 years only, it can be deemed that length of their stay in the prison can't be directly associated with the pattern of recidivism from 2020 to 2022.

Table 11. Frequencies of Length of Incarceration by Pattern of Recidivism

Length of Incarceration		Year of Recidivism			Total
		2020	2021	2022	
Less than a month	Count	0	2	4	6
	Expected Count	1.5	2.0	2.5	6.0
1 month & 1 day to 6 months	Count	8	7	8	23
	Expected Count	5.9	7.6	9.5	23.0
6 months & 1 day to 6 years	Count	10	11	14	35
	Expected Count	9.0	11.5	14.5	35.0
6 years & 1 day to 12 years	Count	0	1	2	3
	Expected Count	.8	1.0	1.2	3.0
12 years & 1 day to 20 years	Count	0	1	1	3
	Expected Count	.8	1.0	1.2	3.0

Length of Incarceration		Year of Recidivism			Total
		2020	2021	2022	
<b>Total</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>70</b>
	<b>Expected Count</b>	<b>18.0</b>	<b>23.0</b>	<b>29.0</b>	<b>70.0</b>

Table 12 presents the scores obtained to describe the recidivism to the following antecedents establish with **familial structure** ( $r_{obt}=.023$ ,  $p_{05}=.850$ ), **cognitive & psychological** ( $r_{obt}=-.037$ ,  $p_{05}=.760$ ), **behavioral & environmental** ( $r_{obt}=.157$ ,  $p_{05}=.194$ ), and **prior criminal offense** ( $r_{obt}=.025$ ,  $p_{05}=.836$ ). Thus, recidivism and all the factors of antecedents do not show a significant association, which allows the researchers to accept the null hypothesis. This affirms that recidivism is not dependent on said antecedents. In relation to the GST,

this study revealed that some variables of recidivism such as familial stress, mental and psychological stress, behavioral and environmental stress, and prior conviction stigma have no direct association with recidivism of respondents in MMDJ from 2020 to 2022. Although GST has strengths, it also has its biggest weakness, as many researchers have diminutive guidance on the hundreds of types and categories under GST, such as life events that are stressful, chronic stressors, and daily life (Herbert & Cohen, 1996).

Table 12. Correlation of Pattern of Recidivism and Antecedents

	Year of Recidivism	Familial Structure	Cognitive & Psychological	Behavioral & Environmental	Prior Criminal Offense
<i>Year of Recidivism</i>	1				
<i>Familial Structure</i>	.023	1			
<i>Cognitive &amp; Psychological</i>	-.037	.301*	1		
<i>Behavioral &amp; Environmental</i>	.157	.202	.482**	1	
<i>Prior Criminal Offense</i>	.025	.129	.125	.257*	1

### Conclusion

It can be concluded that the younger the age of recidivists the higher the chances to recidivate. The majority of recidivists are violators of controlled drugs or other psychoactive substances, they are mostly male, unmarried, and incarcerated from 6 months and 1 day to 6 years. The researchers believed that a shorter punishment removes the significance of imprisonment as a deterrence to would-be perpetrators and to current offenders. Likewise, the pattern of recidivism in the Metro Manila District Jail (MMDJ) from 2020 to 2022 was revealed to be affected by the existence of the COVID-19 pandemic. Moreover, said pattern of recidivism shows no significant association with the antecedents of recidivism such as familial structure, cognitive and psychological factors, behavioral and environmental factors, and stigma of prior criminal offense. However,

given the limited data, of which only 70 recidivists of the MMDJ from 2020 to 2022 participated in said study, it can be assumed that said sample size affects the results. Relatedly, it can be assumed that PDLs deemed to be recidivists incarcerated at the MMDJ from 2020 to 2022 are neither affected by the predictive variables nor antecedents of recidivism described herein. Albeit said predictive variables and antecedents' association to the pattern of recidivism may have not the same results with other recidivists incarcerated in other jail/prison facilities.

### Acknowledgement

We would like to acknowledge the Jail Warden of the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology for allowing us to conduct this study. Likewise, acknowledgement is also given to the recidivists who find time answering the survey

questionnaire without their voluntary participation this study is impossible to finish.

## References

- Andresen, S. H., Andersen, L. H., & Skov, P. E. (2015) Effect of marriage and spousal criminality on recidivism, *J. Marriage Fam.*, vol. 77, no. 2, pp. 496-509. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12176>
- Bayer, P. J., Hjalmarsson, R., & Pozen, D. (2007) Building criminal capital behind bars: Peer effects in juvenile corrections, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, vol. 124, no. 1, pp. 105-147. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w12932>
- Brame, R., Mulvey, E. P., Schubert, C. A., & Piquero, A. R. (2018) Recidivism in a sample of serious adolescent offenders, *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 167-187. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10940-016-9329-2>
- Chenane, J. L., Brennan, P. K., Steiner, B., & Ellison, J. M. (2015) Racial and ethnic differences in the predictive validity of the level of service inventory-revised among prison inmates, *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, vol. 42, no. 3, pp. 286-303. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854814548181>
- Co, J.C., Estel, J.D., Portes, P.J., & Rondina, G.B., (2016). Reintegration and Recidivism: A Phenomenological Study on those who made it through the Bars. College of Arts and Sciences: University of San Carlos, Cebu City, Philippines. [https://www.academia.edu/31342299/Reintegration\\_and\\_Recidivism\\_A\\_Phenomenological\\_Study\\_On\\_Those\\_Who\\_Made\\_It\\_Through\\_The\\_Bars](https://www.academia.edu/31342299/Reintegration_and_Recidivism_A_Phenomenological_Study_On_Those_Who_Made_It_Through_The_Bars) [8 June 2023].
- Esposito, M. M., & King, A. (2021) New York City: COVID-19 quarantine and crime, *Journal of Criminal Psychology*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 203-221. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JCP-10-2020-0046>
- Flores-Barolo, M.G. & Vicente, J.B. (2019). Challenges and Coping Mechanisms of Persons Deprived of Liberty of Sablayan Prison and Penal Farm in the Philippines. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Management and Social Sciences*. Vol. 8, No.11. <https://garph.co.uk/IJARMSS/Nov2019/G-2759.pdf>
- Friedmann, A. (2014). Lowering Recidivism through Family Communication. *Prison Legal News*. <https://www.prisonlegalnews.org/news/2014/apr/15/lowering-recidivism-through-family-communication/>
- Galbiati, R., & Drago, F. (2012) 'Deterrent effect of imprisonment', in G. Bruinsma & D. Weisburd (eds.), *Encyclopedia of criminology and criminal justice*, pp. 1023-1030, New York: Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-5690-2\\_407](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-5690-2_407)
- Herbert, T.B. & Cohen, S. (1996). Measurement Issues in Research on Psychosocial Stress. In *Psychosocial Stress*, edited by Howard B. Kaplan. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Hester, R. (2018) Prior record and recidivism risk, *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, vol. 44, pp. 353-375. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-018-9460-8>
- Huebner, B. M., & Berg, M. T. (2009) Examining the sources of variation in risk for recidivism, *Justice Quarterly*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 146-173. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07418820903365213>
- James, N. (2015) *Offender reentry: Correctional statistics, reintegration into the community, and recidivism*, Available: <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RL34287.pdf> [06 June 2023]
- McCoy, L. A., & Miller, H. A. (2013) Comparing gender across risk and recidivism in non-violent offenders, *Women & Criminal Justice*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 143-162. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08974454.2012.759054>
- Mears, D. P., Cochran, J. C., & Bales, W. D. (2012) Gender differences in the effects of prison on recidivism, *Journal of Criminal Justice*, vol. 40, no. 5, pp. 370-378. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2012.06.009>
- Nagin, D. S., Cullen, F. T., & Jonson, C. L. (2009) Imprisonment and reoffending, *Crime and Justice*, vol. 38. <https://doi.org/10.1086/599202>

- Nwankwo, B. C., Chibuike, O. B., Otu, O. A., Ndubueze, O. P., & Emmanuel, O. K. (2018) Locus of control and marital status as predictors of recidivism among prison inmates in Abakaliki, *IFE PsycholA*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 120-133.
- Rakes, S., Frost, S. G., & Tripodi, S. J. (2018) Recidivism among older adults: Correlates of prison re-entry, *Justice Policy Journal*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 1-15. <https://www.cjcrj.org/media/import/documents/recidivism-among-older-adults-correlates-of-prison-reentry.pdf>
- Rhodes, W., Gaes, G. G., Kling, R., & Cutler, C. (2018) Relationship between prison length of stay and recidivism: A study using regression discontinuity and instrumental variables with multiple break points, *Criminology & Public Policy*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 731-769. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12382>
- Roach, M.A., & Schanzenbach, M.M. (2015). The Effect of Prison Sentence Length on Recidivism: Evidence from Random Judicial Assignment. Northwestern Law & Econ Research Paper No. 16-08. [https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=2701549](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2701549)
- Sanyal, S. (2010) Rehabilitation of prisoners: A debatable issue, *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3226279>
- Shaw, A.R. (2020) Can General Strain Theory be Used to Explain the Relationship Between Recidivism and Secure Placement? University of Central Florida. <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1833&context=honorsthesis>
- Svönudóttir, S. (2015) *A study on repeat offenders' experience in society between prison sentences in Iceland*, Master's thesis in Criminology. Aalborg University.
- United States Sentencing Commission. (2019) *Recidivism among federal violent offenders*, Washington, DC: United States Sentencing Commission.
- Vries, A.M. & Liem, M. (2011). Recidivism of Juvenile Homicide Offenders. *Behav Sci Law*. 2011 Jul-Aug;29(4):483-98. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21484856/>
- Wake, A. D., & Kandula, U. R. (2022) The global prevalence and its associated factors toward domestic violence against women and children during COVID-19 pandemic—"The shadow pandemic": A review of cross-sectional studies, *Women's Health*, vol. 18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745505722109553>
- Welu, S.G., Aregawi, D.H., Gebreslassie, H.T. & Kidanu, K.G. (2021). Prevalence and Associated Factors of Depressive Disorder among Prisoners in Mekelle General Prison Center, Tigray, Ethiopia: A Cross-Sectional Study Design. *Depression Research and Treatment*. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8187058/>
- Western, B. & Sirois, C. (2019). Racialized Re-entry: Labor Market Inequality After Incarceration. *Race and Incarceration*. <https://www.russellsage.org/sites/default/files/Western-Sirois-2019%5B1%5D.pdf>
- Wilson, W.J. (1997). *When work disappears: The world of the new urban poor*. New York, NY: Vintage. <https://fundacion-rama.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/2063.-When-Work-Disappears-%E2%80%A6-Wilson.pdf>
- Wright, K.N. & Wright, K. E. (1993). *Family Life and Delinquency and Crime: A Policymakers' Guide to the Literature*. <https://www.ojp.gov/pdffiles1/Digitization/140517NCIRS.pdf>
- Yarhouse, M.S. & Sells, J.N. (2017). *Family therapies: A Comprehensive Christian Appraisal* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press. <https://shorturl.at/bgzT4>
- Zgoba, K. M., & Salerno, L. M. (2017) A three-year recidivism analysis of state correctional releases, *Criminal Justice Studies*, vol. 30, no. 4, pp. 331-345. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1478601X.2017.1364641>
- Zhong, R., Baranoski, M., Feigenson, N., Davidson, L., Buchanan, A., & Zonana, H. V. (2014) So, you're sorry? the role of remorse in criminal law, *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law Online*, vol. 42, no. 1, pp. 39-48.