to eliminate those with substance abuse problems. Such individuals may pose a security risk. Although further empirical study is needed, it seems that, if a relationship between substance abuse and terrorist recidivism exists, it is likely to be conditional on the terrorist group to which an individual belongs.

While we have offered several testable hypotheses regarding the predictors of terrorist recidivism, we would like to emphasize that this list should not be viewed as exhaustive, but merely as a starting point based upon our review of the literature on criminal recidivism. Because many terrorists are, in fact, motivated and mobilized by an acceptance of underlying ideology, it seems that the likelihood of recidivism for some terrorists is also likely to be shaped by changes in the social and political context and the organization to which he or she belonged (e.g. Taylor & Horgan, 2006). Changes in the political context, for instance – the opening up of political negotiations – may shape individual beliefs about the necessity of violence and influence an individual's desire to resort to terrorism. He or she might now view politics as opposed to violence as the way forward. For others, particularly those whose involvement was motivated by the need for kinship, disintegrating relations between members of an organization may reduce their likelihood of re-engagement as they are no longer likely to derive a 'social benefit' from re-engagement in the terrorist organization. The important point here is that focusing on the rationale for terrorism for the individual may provide a meaningful way to assess his or her risk of re-engagement as organizational and political circumstances change.

Reducing the Risk of Terrorist Recidivism

The above hypotheses, if they hold, suggest that reducing the risk of terrorist recidivism requires: 1) weakening an individual's commitment to a violent, radical ideology as well as his or her bonds to others that support that same ideology and 2) facilitating his or her acquisition of

certain social achievements (e.g., stable employment, a family, an education) and development of pro-social bonds.

Given, however, that individuals' reasons for engaging in terrorism differ (e.g., commitment to the ideology, need for belonging), as might their reasons or risk factors for re-engaging, the question becomes: How do we assess an individual's risk and design targeted interventions that take into account individual motivation? We believe, similar to Mullins (2011), that Andrews (1989) and later Andrews' and his colleagues' (1990; 1994) argument that reducing criminal recidivism requires adherence to four principles: *risk, need, responsivity and professional discretion* offers some guidance here.

With regard to the first principle, risk, Andrews, Bonta, et al. (1990) maintained that studies have shown that there are known antecedents of criminal activity and recidivism, which we have reviewed here. Assessments of risk, according to Andrews, Bonta et al. (1990) should not be based on these risk factors and not on clinical judgments alone, for past work has shown that professional judgments, even by the most competent practitioners, are poor predictors of future criminality (see e.g., Meehl, 1954; Little & Schneidman, 1959; Dawes, Faust et al., 1989; Glover, Nicholson et al., 2002).

Once those who have the highest risk of recidivating have been identified, they should, according to Andrews, Bonta, et al. (1990), receive the highest level of treatment - that is, the most attention and intensive service possible. Those at a lower risk for recidivism, on the other hand, require less care. Although the risk principle is usually applied with regard to who is more likely to reoffend upon release, it may also be applied to the timing of intervention. A 2007 report by the National Research Council, for instance, argues that since we know released criminals are at the highest risk of reoffending during the initial days, weeks, months, and year after their release, treatment should be the most intense during this period. According to the

report, a “person should not leave prison without an immediately available person and plan for post-release life” including counseling, enrollment in drug treatment programs, parole supervision, assistance finding work, mentors, assistance obtaining identification, clothes, housing, etc. (National Research Council, 2007). The same, of course, is likely to be true of disengaged terrorists. They need a strong support system in place as they adapt to their new role and those at a greater risk of returning to the fight are more likely to need more care.

With respect to the second principle, need*,* Andrews and his colleagues (1990) argued that the types of service or treatment that an individual offender receives should be tailored to his or her criminogenic needs. As a reminder, criminogenic needs are those dynamic factors that when changed reduce an individual’s propensity to engage in criminal activity (Andrews & Bonta, 1994). Thus, different individuals may have very different criminogenic needs. Certain needs may be criminogenic in some individuals, but not others (Andrews & Bonta, 1994). Initiatives should be aimed at first identifying, and then reducing or eliminating an offender’s particular criminogenic needs through, for instance, changing antisocial attitudes, breaking associations with antisocial peers or family members, increasing self-control, treating substance abuse, and altering the perceived costs/rewards to criminal behavior (Andrews, 1989). For those engaging in terrorism, of course, this would mean first identifying, and then focusing on and addressing those factors responsible for the individual’s initial and continued involvement in terrorism. What particular function or what need does involvement in terrorism serve for the individual in question? How can we reduce his/her propensity to resort to terrorism by eliminating or reducing that need or fulfilling it in another legal, non-violent manner?

The third principle, responsivity, holds that treatment should be delivered in such a way that it matches the offender’s learning style and abilities (Andrews et al., 1990). Specifically, interpersonal sensitivity, interpersonal anxiety, verbal intelligence, and cognitive maturity

should be considered when determining the nature of treatment (Andres & Bonta, 1994). Andrews (1989), Andrews and Bonta (1994), and others (e.g., Gendreau, Little et al., 1996; Allen, Mackenzie et al., 2001; Taxman, 2008) argue that cognitive-behavioral therapy (CBT) and social learning approaches have the greatest potential to lower one's risk of recidivism. According to Andrews, Bonta, et al. (1990) these approaches "shift the density of the incentives and disincentives for criminal and noncriminal acts in the favor of noncriminal alternatives" (p. 201). Treatment should include modeling and the reinforcement of anti-criminal behavior, the development and practice of new skills, role-play, verbal guidance, and the provision of resources (Andrews, 1989). Similarly, Allen, Mackenzie et al. (2001) hold that moral reconation therapy and reasoning and rehabilitation programs - two types of CBT - reduce recidivism. The first, moral reconation therapy (MRT) increases an offender's moral reasoning ability through confrontation, stressing delayed gratification, and an emphasis on the means in addition to the ends. Reasoning and rehabilitation seeks to improve an offender's cognitive skills including his or her ability to identify potential consequences of certain behaviors and engage in means-end reasoning (Allen et al., 2001). Andrews further argues that other approaches, besides CBT, such as group interactions without the presence of a leader to dissuade pro-criminal attitudes; approaches guided by deterrence theory (i.e. fear of punishment or retribution) or labeling theory (i.e. the idea crime is a self-fulfilling prophecy driven by minority stereo-types); isolated community service programs, or restitution are unlikely to be rehabilitative as are "client-centered counseling" (where the psychotherapist just listens) or "unstructured psychodynamic therapy" (Andrews, 1989, p. 16). A recent report by the National Research Council supports these claims. The report concludes that, to date; only CBT and treatment for substance abuse (especially when combined with criminal supervision) have been shown to be effective in reducing recidivism. The empirical evidence for all other forms of treatment is not

methodologically sound because these studies are subject to selection bias - that is, they do not allow for random assignment into the treatment and control groups (National Research Council, 2007). While there are no studies of the role that CBT plays in reducing the risk of recidivism among former terrorists, CBT is a key part of certain de-radicalization programs, like the Saudi initiative. A more important take away point here is that the nature of the treatment should be tailored in such a way to account for differences in the education and learning style of the terrorist and perhaps, his or her openness to change.

The fourth and last principle, professional discretion, allows for an override of the first three principles in unique cases that do not "fit the formula" (Andrews & Bonta, 1994). Andrews (1989) notes that ethical, legal, and humanitarian factors should be taken into consideration when applying and implementing principles one through three. This point easily seems applicable to terrorism where one must be sensitive to differences in culture and political beliefs. Risk reduction initiatives that are not sensitive to these differences may only backfire, increasing a terrorist's commitment to his or her group and perhaps, its violent, radical ideology.

Assessing whether certain treatments, programs, or other interventions are successful at reducing recidivism is tricky. As already mentioned, the individuals who participate are usually not selected at random. When this is true, it is impossible to determine whether differences in the recidivism rate are due to the effects of the treatment, program, or intervention on the behavior of participants or inherent differences between participants and non-participants. Experimental research can help circumvent these problems, but it may pose a number of ethical problems (e.g. denying certain treatments to those who need/want them).

Conclusion

Based upon our review of the literature on criminal recidivism, we have offered a definition and method of measurement for terrorist recidivism and hypothesized a number of

potential risk factors. The empirical investigation of these hypotheses, we believe, is a fruitful avenue for future research.

In closing, we would like to reiterate a point made by Rosenfeld (2008) with regard to criminal recidivism that we believe is essential for how we think about estimated rates of terrorist recidivism. Rosenfeld (2008) cautions that the criminal recidivism rate is a poor predictor of how well we are rehabilitating offenders because it "confounds successes with failures." According to Rosenfeld, if we believe that some repeat offenders are not amenable to rehabilitation and that most first-time offenders usually desist, then an ideal criminal justice system - which reserves prison for those who cannot be rehabilitated in other ways - would have a high rate of recidivism.[8] The system would have isolated and confined those individuals not likely to change their ways under any circumstances. A low recidivism rate, on the other hand, might signal the unnecessary imprisonment of individuals likely to respond to other forms of treatment such as CBT. In response to these issues, Rosenfeld (2008) calls for future research to identify and test the effects of various treatments or interventions on different sub-sets of the prison population (e.g. first-time offenders, career criminals, etc.). He further cautions that, although recidivism warrants our immediate attention, high rates of recidivism may occur alongside a high or low incidence of crime in the general population and the larger picture must be considered. The same is true with regard to terrorism. Even if an alarming percentage of terrorists released from prison may return to terrorism, the question is whether we have effectively isolated and offered alternative, effective forms of treatment (e.g., de-radicalization programs) to those most likely to change.

[8] This is true unless, of course, as Rosenfeld (2008) points out, these criminals are sentenced to life or death.

Duncan, R., Kennedy, W, et al. (1995). Four-factor model of recidivism in male juvenile offenders. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 24,* 250-257.

Dwyer, C. D. (2007). Risk, politics and the 'scientification' of political judgement: Prisoner release and conflict transformation in Northern Ireland. *British Journal of Criminology, 47,* 779-797.

Elliott, D. S., Huizinga, D., et al. (1989). *Multiple problem youth: Delinquency, substance use, and mental health problems.* New York, Springer-Verlang.

Eysenck, H.J. (1977). *Crime and Personality*. London: Paladin Books.

Eysenck, H.J. (1992). Four ways five factors are not basic. *Personality and Individual Differences, 13,* 667-673.

Fabelo, T. (2000). *The Impact of Educational Achievement of Inmates in the Windham School District on Recidivism*. Criminal Justice Policy Council.

Fagan, J. (1989). Cessation of family violence: Deterrence and dissuasion. In L. Ohlin and M. Tonry. *Family violence*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press. **11**.

Farrall, S. (2002). Long-term absences from probation: Officers' and probationers' accounts. *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice, 43,* 358-367.

Farrall, S. & Maruna, S. (2004). Desistance-focused criminal justice policy research: Introduction to a special issue on desistance from crime and public policy. *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice, 43,* 358-367.

Farrington, D.P., Gallagher, B., Morley, L., St. Ledger, R.J., & West, D.J. (1986). Unemployment, school leaving, and crime. *The British Journal of Criminology, 26,* 335-356.

Farrington, D.P., Gallagher, B., et al. (1988). *Cambridge study in delinquent development: Long-term follow-up*. Institute of Criminology, Cambridge University.

Farrington, D. P. & Hawkins, D. (1991). Predicting participation, early onset, and later persistence in officially recorded offending. *Criminal Behavior and Mental Health, 1,* 1-33.

Farrington, D.P. & West, D.J. (1995). Effects of marriage, separation and children on offending by adult males. In J. Hagan (Ed.), pp. 249-281. *Current Perspectives on Aging and the Life Cycle, Vol. 4: Delinquency and Disrepute in the Life Course*. . Greenwich, CT, JAI Press.

Forehand, R., King, H.E., Peed, S., & Yoder, P. (1975). Mother-child interactions: Comparison of non-compliant clinic group and a non-clinic group. *Behavioral Research Therapy, 13,* 79-84.

Gadd, D. & Farrall, S. (2004). Criminal careers, desistance and subjectivity: Interpreting men's narratives of change. *Theoretical Criminology, 8,* 123-156.

Gaes, G.G., Flanagan, T.J., Motiuk, L.L., & Stewart, L. (1999). Adult correctional treatment. In M. Tonry and J. Petersilia (Eds.). *Prisons*. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Ganzer, V. J. & Sarason, I.G. (1973). Variables associated with recidivism among juvenile delinquents. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 40,* 1-5.

Gardner, F. (2008). *Saudi jails aim to tackle terror*. BBC News Online.

Gartner, R. & Piliavin, I. (1988). The aging offender and the aged offender. In P. B. Baltes, D. L. Featherman, and R. M. Lerner (Eds.). *Life-Span Development and Behaviour*. Hillside, N.J., Erlbaum.

Gendreau, P. & Andrews, D.A. (1990). Tertiary prevention: What the meta-analysis of the offender treatment literature tells us about “what works.” *Canadian Journal of Criminology, 32*, 173-184.

Gendreau, P., T. Little, et al. (1996). A meta-analysis of the predictors of adult offender recidivism: What works!" *Criminolog, 34,* 575-607.

Gendreau, P. & Ross, R.R. (1979). Effective correctional treatment: Bibliotherapy for cynics. *Crime & Delinquency, 25,* 463-489.

Gendreau, P. & Ross, R.R. (1987). Revivification of rehabilitation: Evidence from the 1980s. *Justice Quarterly, 4,* 349-407.

Gendreau, P., Andrews, D., Coggin, C., & Chanteloupe, F. (1992). *The development of clinical policy and guidelines for the prediction of criminal behavior in criminal justice settings*. Unpublished Manuscript. University of New Brunswick, St.John, New Brunswick.

Gerber, J., & Fritsch, E.J. (1995). Adult academic and vocational correctional education programs: A review of recent research. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 22*, 119-142.

Gibbens, T.C. (1984). Borstal boys after 25 years. *British Journal of Criminology, 24,* 46-59.

Giordano, P. C., Cernkovich, S.A., et al. (2003). Changes in friendship relations over the life course: Implications for desistance from crime. *Criminology, 41,* 293-328.

Giordano, P. C., Cernkovich, S.A., et al. (2002). Gender, crime, and desistance: Toward a theory of cognitive transformation. *American Journal of Sociology, 107,* 990-1064.

Glaser, D. (1969). *The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System*. Indianapolis, IN: Bobb-Merrill, Co.

Glover, A. J. J., Nicholson, D.E., et al. (2002). A comparison of predictors of general and violent recidivism among high-risk federal offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 29,* 235-249.

Glueck, S. & Glueck, E. (1940). *Juvenile delinqunts grown up*. New York, The Commonwealth Fund.

Glueck, S. & Glueck, E. (1943). *Criminal careers in retrospect*. New York, The Commonwealth Fund.

Glueck, S. & Glueck, E. (1950). *Unraveling juvenile delinquency*. New York, The Commonwealth Fund.

Glueck, S. & Glueck, E. (1968). *Delinquents and nondelinquents in perspective*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press.

Goddard, H. H. (1920). *Human efficiency and levels of intelligence, lectures delivered at Princeton University April 7,8,10,11, 1919*. Princeton,, Princeton University Press.

Gottfredson, M. & Hirschi, T. (1990). *A general theory of crime*. Stanford, Stanford University Press.

Gove, W. R. (1985). The effect of age and gender on deviant behavior: A biopsychosocial perspective. In A. S. Rossi (Ed.). *Gender and the Life Course*. New York, Aldine.

Guantanamo Review Task Force. *Final Report.* Department of Justice. Retrieved from http://www.justice.gov/ag/guantanamo-review-final-report.pdf.

Hanson, R. K. & Bussière, M.T. (1996). Predicting relapse: A meta-analysis of sexual offender recidivism studies. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 66*, 348-362.

Hanson, R. K. & Harris, A.J.R. (2000). STABLE-2000. D. o. t. S. General. Ottawa, ON, Canada.

Hanson, R. K., Henggeler, S.W., et al. (1984). Demographic, individual, and family relationship correlates of serious and repeated crime among adolescents and their siblings. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 52,* 528-538.

Harer, M.D. (1995). Recidivism among federal prisoners released in 1987. *Journal of Corrections***,** *46*, 98-128.

Hayes, S. F. & Joscelyn, T. (2009). Rehab for jihadists: The Gitmo problem is also a Yemen problem. *The Weekly Standard, 14*.

Heaven, P.C.L (1996). Personality and self-reported delinquency: Analysis of the Big Five personality dimensions. *Personality and Individual Differences, 20,* 47-54.

Heaven, P.C.L., & Virgen, M. (2001). Personality, perceptions of family and peer influences, and males' self-reported delinquency. *Personality and Individual Differences, 30,* 321-331.

Herrnstein, R. J. & Murray, C.A. (1994). *The bell curve: intelligence and class structure in American life.* New York, Free Press.

Hindelang, M. J., Gottfredson, M.R., et al. (1978). *Victims of Personal Crime: An Empirical Foundation for a Theory of Personal Victimization*. Cambridge, Mass., Ballinger.

Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of Delinquency*. Berkely and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Hirschi, T. & Gottfredson, M.R. (1983). Age and the explanation of crime. *American Journal of Sociology, 89,* 552-584.

Hirschi, T. & Hindelang, M.J. (1977). Intelligence and delinquency: A revisionist review. *American Sociological Review, 42,* 571-587.

Hoffman, P. B. & Beck, J.L. (1984). Burnout—Age at release from prison and recidivism. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 12,* 617-623.

Hoge, R.D., D.A. Andrews, and A.W. Leschied (1996). An Investigation of Risk and Protective Factors in a Sample of Youthful Offenders. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 37,* 419-424.

Hoge, R. D., Leschied, A.W., et al. (1993). *An investigation of young offender services in the province of Ontario: A report of the repeat offender project*. Toronto, Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services.

Horgan, J. (2009). *Walking away from terrorism: accounts of disengagement from radical and extremist movements*. Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon; New York, NY, Routledge.

Horgan, J. & Braddock, K. (2010). Rehabilitating the terrorists: Challenges in assessing the effectiveness of de-radicalization programs. *Terrorism and Political Violence, 22,* 267-291.

Horney, J., Osgood, D.W., et al. (1995). Criminal careers in the short term: Intra-individual variability in crime and its relation to local life circumstance. *American Sociological Review, 60,* 655-673).

House Armed Services Committee (HASC) (2012). *Leaving Guantanamo*, 112th Congress, HASC Committee Print 112-4.

Huba, G.J., & Benlter, P.M. (1983). Test of drug use causal model using asymptotically distribution methods. *Journal of Drug Education, 13,* 3-17.

Huesmann, L. R., Eron, L.D., et al. (1984). The stability of aggression over time and generations. *Developmental Psychology, 20,* 1120-1134.

Irwin, J. (1970). *The Felon*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Joscelyn, T. (2012). Ex-Gitmo detainee delivers ransom demands for kidnapped Saudi. *The Long War Journal*. Retrieved from http://www.longwarjournal.org/archives/2012/04/ex-gitmo_detainee_de_1.php.

Kandel, D. (1973). Adolescent marihuana use: Role of parents and peers. *Science, 181,* 1067-1070.

Katsiyannis, A., & Archwamety, T. (1997). Factors related to recidivism among delinquent youths in a state correctional facility. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 6,* 43-55.

Kazemian, L. (2007). Desistance from crime: Theoretical, empirical, methodological, and policy considerations. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 23,* 5-27.

Knight, B.J., Osborn, S.G., & West, D.J. (1977). Early marriage and criminal tendency in males. *British Journal of Criminology, 17,* 348-360.

Knight, B. J. & West, D.J. (1975). Temporary and continuing delinquency. *British Journal of Criminology, 15,* 43-50.

Krueger, A. & Maleckova, J. (2010). Education, poverty and terrorism: Is there a causal connection? *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 17,* 119-144.

Kubrin, C. E. & Steward, E.A. (2006). Predicting who reoffends: The neglected role of neighborhood context in recidivism studies. *Criminology, 44,* 165-197.

Lang, R. A., Holden, R., et al. (1987). Personality and criminality in violent offenders. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 2.*

Langan, P. A. & Levin, D.J. (2002). *Recidivism of prisoners released in 1994*. Washington D.C., U.S. Department of Justice.

LaFree, G. & Milller, E. (2009). Desistance from terrorism: What can we learn from criminology? *Dynamics of Asymmetric Conflict, 1,* 203-230.

Laub, J. (2011). Personal correspondence. C. Thoroughgood.

Laub, J. H., Nagin, D.S., et al. (1998). Trajectories of change in criminal offending: Good marriages and the desistance process. *American Sociological Review, 63,* 225-238.

Laub, J. H. & Sampson, R.J. (2001). Understanding desistance from crime. *Crime and Justice, 28,* 1-69.

Laub, J. H. & Sampson, R.J. (2003). *Shared beginnings, divergent lives: delinquent boys to age 70.* Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press.

LeBlanc, M. & Fréchette, M. (1989). *Male criminal activity from childhood through youth: multilevel and developmental perspectives*. New York, Springer-Verlag.

LeBlanc, M. & Loeber, R. (1998). Developmental criminology updated. In M. Tonry. *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Little, K. B. & Schneidman, E.S. (1959). Congruencies among interpretations of psychological test and anamnestic data. *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied, 73,* 1-42.

Lochner, L. & Moretti, E. (2004). The effect of education on crime: Evidence from prison inmates, arrests, and self-reports. *American Economic Review, 94,* 155-189.

Loeber, R. & Dishion, T.J. (1983). Early predictors of male delinquency: A review. *Psychological Bulletin, 94,* 68-99.

Loeber, R. & LeBlanc, M. (1990). Toward a developmental criminology. In M. Tonry and N. Morris (Eds.). *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research, vol. 12*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

MacKenzie, D. L. (2006). *What works in corrections: Reducing the criminal activities of offenders and delinquents*. New York, Cambridge University Press.

Manza, J., Brooks, C., et al. (2004). Public attitudes toward felon disenfranchisement in the United States. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 68,* 275-286.

Manza, J. & Uggen, C. (2006). *Locked out: Felon disenfranchisement and American democracy*. New York, Oxford University Press.

Martinson, R. (1974). What works? Questions and answeres about prison reform. *The Public Interest, 35, 22*-54.

Maruna, S. (2001). *Making Good: How Ex-Convicts Reform and Rebuild Their Lives*. Washington D.C., American Psychological Association.

Maume, M.O., Ousey, G.C., & Beaver, K. (2005). Cutting the grass: A reexamination of the link between marital attachment, delinquent peers and desistance from marijuana use. *Quantitative Criminology, 21,* 27-53.

McCauley, C. & Segal, M. (1987). Social psychology of terrorist groups. in C. Hendrick (Ed.). *Review of Personality and Social Psychology*, pp. 231-256. Beverly Hills: Sage.

McCord, J. (1980). Patterns of deviance. In S. B. Sells, R. Crandall, M. Roff, J. S. Strauss and W. Pollin (Eds.). *Human Functioningin Longitudinal Perspective*. Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins.

Mears, D. P., Wang, X., et al. (2008). Social ecology and recidivism: Implications for prisoner reentry. *Criminology, 46,* 301-340.

Meehl, P. E. (1954). *Clinical versus statistical prediction: A theoretical analysis and a review of the evidence*. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota.

Merari, A. (2005). Social, organizational and psychological factors in suicide terrorism. In T. Bjorgo (Ed.), pp. 70-89. *Root causes of terrorism: Myths, realities and ways forward.* London: Routledge.

Mischkowitz, R. (1994). Desistance from a delinquent way of life? In E.G.M Weitekamp and H.J. Kerner (Eds.). *Cross-National Longitudinal Research on Human development and Criminal Behavior*. London: Kluwer.

Moffitt, T. E. (1993). Adolescent-limited and life-course-persistent antisocial behavior: A developmental taxonomy. *Psychological Review, 100,* 674-701.

Monahan, J. (2012). The individual risk assessment of terrorism. *Journal of Psychology, Public Policy and Law,* 18, 167-205.

Motiuk, L., Bonta, J., et al. (1986). Classification in correctional halfway houses: The relative and incremental predictive criterion validities of the Megargee-MMPI and LSI Systems." *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 13,* 33-46.

Mulder, E., Brand, E., et al. (2010). A classification of risk factors in serious juvenile offenders and the relation between patterns of risk factors and recidivism. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health, 20*, 23-38.

Mullins, S. (2010). Rehabilitation of Islamist terrorists: Lessons from criminology. *Dynamics of Asymmetric Conflict, 3,* 162-193.

Myner, J., Santman, J., et al. (1998). Variables related to recidivism among juvenile offenders. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 42,* 65-80.

Nagin, D. S., Farrington, D.P., et al. (1995). Life-course trajectories of different types of offenders. *Criminology, 33,* 111-139.

National Research Council (2007). *Parole, desistance from crime, and community integration*. Washington D.C., The National Academies Press.

Niarhos, F. J. & Routh, D.K. (1992). The role of clinical assessment in the juvenile court: Predictors of juvenile dispositions and recidivism. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 21*, 151-159.

O'Donnell, I., Baumer, E.P., et al. (2008). Recidivism in the republic of Ireland. *Criminology and Criminal Justice, 8,* 123-146.

Oberwittler, D. (2004). A multilevel analysis of neighbourhood contextual effects on serious juvenile offending: The role of subcultural values and social disorganization. *European Journal of Criminology, 1,* 201-235.

Osborn, S. G. & West, D.J. (1979). Conviction records of fathers and sons compared. *British Journal of Criminology, 19,* 120-133.

Pager, D. (2003). The mark of a criminal record. *American Journal of Sociology, 108,* 937-975.

Patterson, G.R. (1982). *A social learning approach: Coercive family process.* Eugene, OR: Castalia.

Patterson, G.R., DeBaryshe, B.D., & Ramsey, E. (1989). A developmental perspective on antisocial behavior. *American Psychologist, 44,* 329-35.

Pew Center on the States (2011). *State of recidivism: The revolving door of America's prisons*. Washington D.C. , The Pew Charitable Trusts.

Pezzin, L. (1995). Earnings prospects, matching effects, and the decision to terminate a criminal career. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 11,* 29-50.

Philipse, M. W. G., Koeter, M.W.J., et al. (2006). Static and dynamic patient characteristics as predictors of criminal recidivism: A prospective study in a Dutch forensic psychiatric sample. *Law and Human Behavior, 30*, 309-327.

Piquero, A. R., Farrington, D.P., et al. (2003). The criminal career paradigm: Background, recent developments, and the way forward. *International Annals of Criminology, 41,* 243-269.

Piquero, N. L. & Benson, M. (2004). White-collar crime and criminal careers. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, *20,* 148-165.

Pluchinsky, D. A. (2008). Global jihadist recidivism: A red flag. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism, 31,* 182-200.

Post, J. (2007). *The mind of the terrorist: The psychology of terrorism from the IRA to Al Qaeda*. New York: Palgrave.

Rabasa, A., Pettyjohn, S.L., GhezRabasa, A., Pettyjohn, S.L., Ghez, J.J., Boucek, C. , J.J., & Boucek, C. (2010). *De-radicalizing Islamist Extremists: A RAND Report*. Washington, D.C., RAND Institute.

Robins, L. N., West, P.A., et al. (1975). Arrests and delinquency in two generations: A study of Black urban families and their children. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines, 16,* 125-140.

Romero, E., Luengo, M.A., & J. Sobral (2001). Personality and antisocial behavior: Study of temperamental dimensions. *Personality and Individual Differences, 31,* 329-348.

Rosenfeld, R. (2008). Recidivism and its discontents. *Criminology and Public Policy, 7,* 311-318.

Rosenfeld, R., Wallman, J., et al. (2005). The contribution of ex-prisoners to crime rates. In J. Travis and C. Visher (Eds.), pp. 80-104. *Prisoner reentry and crime in America*. New York, Cambridge University Press.

Rutter, M. & Giller, H. (1984). *Juvenile delinquency: Trends and perspectives*. New York, Guilford Press.

Sampson, R. J. & Laub, J.H. (1990). Crime and deviance over the life course: The salience of adult social bonds. *American Sociological Review, 55,* 609-627.

Sampson, R. J. & Laub, J.H. (1993). *Crime in the making pathways and turning points through life.* Cambridge, Harvard University Press.

Sampson, R.J., Laub, J.H., et al. (2006). Does marriage reduce crime? A counterfactual approach to within-individual causal effects. *Criminology, 44,* 465-503.

Sarnecki, J. (1985). *Predicting social maladjustment Stockholm boys grown up, 1. Research Report.* Stockholm, National Council for Crime Prevention.

Schuessler, K.F., & Cressey, D.R. (1950). Personality characteristics of criminals. *American Journal of Sociology, 55,* 476-484.

Serin, R. C., Peters, R.D., et al. (1990). Predictors of psychopathy and release outcome in a criminal population. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 2,* 419-422.

Shane, S. & Weiser, B. (April, 24, 2011). Judging detainees' risk, often with flawed evidence. *New York Times*.

Shover, N. (1985). *Aging criminals.* Beverly Hills, Sage Publications.

Shover, N. (1996). *Great pretenders: Pursuits and careers of persistent thieves*. Boulder, Westview Press.

Shover, N., Clelland, D.A., et al. (1986). *Enforcement or negotiation: Constructing a regulatory bureaucracy*. Albany, N.Y., State University of New York Press.

Shover, N. & Thompson, C.Y. (1992). Age, differential expectations, and crime desistance. *Criminology, 30,* 89-104.

Snyder, J.J. (1977). Reinforcement analysis of interaction in problem and nonproblem families. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 86,* 528-535.

Solomon, A., Kachnowski, V., et al. (2005). *Does parole work? Analyzing the impact of postprison supervison on rearrest outcomes*. Washington D.C., Urban Institute.

Stattin, H. & Magnusson, D. (1991). Stability and change in criminal behavior up to age 30. *British Journal of Criminology, 31,* 327-346.

Stattin, H., Magnusson, D., et al. (1989). Criminal activity at different ages. *British Journal of Criminology, 29, 3*68-385.

Taxman, F. S. (2008). No illusions: Offender and organizational change in Maryland's proactivecommunity supervision efforts. *Criminology and Public Policy, 7,* 275-302.

Taylor, M. & Quayle, E. (1994). *Terrorist lives*. London: Brassey.

Tennenbaum, D. (1977). Personality and criminality: A summary and implications of the literatures. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 5,* 225-235.

Thompson, M. (January 11, 2012). Happy 10th Birthday, Guantanamo Bay. *Time.* Retrieved from http://battleland.blogs.time.com/2012/01/11/happy-10th-birthday-guantanamo-bay/#ixzz1kIOcDlM2.

Thornberry, T. P. (1997). Developmental theories of crime and delinquency. New Brunswick, NJ, Transaction Publishing.

Thornberry, T. P. & Farnworth, M. (1982). Social correlates of criminal involvement: Further evidence on the relationship between social status and criminal behavior. *American Sociological Review, 47,* 505-518.

Tittle, C. R. & Meier, R.F. (1990). Specifying the SES/Delinquency Relationship. *Criminology, 28,* 271-299.

Tittle, C. R. & Meier, R.F. (1991). Specifying the ses/delinquency relationship by social characteristics of contexts. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 28,* 430-455.

Trasler, G. (1979). Delinquency, recidivism, and desistance. *British Journal of Criminology, 19,* 314-322.

Uggen, C. (2000). Work as a turning point in the life course of criminals: A duration modle of age, employment, and recidivism. *American Sociological Review, 67*, 529-546.

Uggen, C. & Manza, J. (2002). Democratic contraction? The political consequences of felon disenfranchisement in the United States. *American Sociological Review, 67,* 777-803.

Uggen, C., Thompson, M, & Behrens, A. (2003). Less than the average citizen: Stigma, role transition, and the civic reintegration of convicted felons. In S. Maruna and R. Immarigeon (Eds.). *After Crime and Punishment: Ex-Offender Reintegration and Desistance from Crime.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Uggen, C. & Massoglia, M. (2003). Desistance from crime and deviance as a turning point in the life course. In J. T. Mortimer and M. J. Shanahan (Eds.). *Handbook of the life course*. New York, Kluwer/Academic Plenum.

Uggen, C. & Wakefield, S. (2005). Young adults reentering the community from the criminal justice system: The challenge of becoming an adult. In D. W. Osgood, M. Foster and C. Flanagan (Eds.). *On Your Own without a Net: the Transition to Adulthood for Vulnerable Populations.* Chicago, Chicago University Press.

Villettaz, P., Killias, M., et al. (2006). *The Effects of Custodial vs. Non-custodial Sentences on Reoffending: A Systematic Review of the State of Knowledge*. Philadelphia, Campbell Collaboration Crime and Justice Group.

Wahler, R.G., Dumas, J.E. (1984). Family factors in childhood psychopathology: Toward a coercion neglect model. In T. Jacob (Ed.). *Family Interaction and Psychopathology*. New York: Plenum Press.

Waldo, G.P., & Dinitz, S. (1967). Personality attributes of the criminal: An analysis of research studies. *Journal of Research in Crime & Delinquency, 4,* 185-202.

Ward, T. & Stewart, C. (2003). Criminogenic needs and human needs: A theoretical critique. *Psychology, Crime, and Law, 9,* 125-143.

Warr, M. (1998). Life-course transitions from desistance and crime. *Criminology, 36,* 183-216.

Weitekam, E. G. M. & Kerner, H.J. (1994). Epilogue: Workshop and plenary discussions, and future directions. In E.G.M. Weitekam and H.J. Kerner (Eds.). *Cross-National Longitudinal Research on Human Development and Criminal Behavior*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands, Kluwer Academic Publishers.

West, D. (1982). Delinquency: Its roots, careers, and prospects. London: Heinemann.

Western, B. (2002). The impact of incarceration on wage mobility and inequality. *American Sociological Review, 67,* 526-546.

Wierson, M. & Forehand, R. (1995). Predicting recidivism in juvenile delinquents: The role of mental health diagnoses and the qualification of conclusions by race. *Behaviour Research and Therapy, 33,* 63-67.

Wilson, R.J., Stewart, L., Stirpe, T., Barrett, M., & Cripps, J.E. (2000). Community-based sexual offender management: Combining parole supervision and treatment to reduce recidivism. *Canadian Journal of Criminology, 42,* 177-188.

Wolfgang, M., Thornberry, T.P., et al. (1987). *From boy to man: From delinquency to crime*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Wooldredge, J., Hartman, J., et al. (1994). Effectiveness of culturally specific community treatment for African American juvenile felons. *Crime & delinquency, 40,* 589-598.

Wright, B.R.E., Caspi, A., Moffitt, T.E., & Silva, P.A. (2001). The effects of social ties on crime vary by criminal propensity: A life-course model of interdependence. *Criminology, 39,* 321-348.

Zamble, E. & Quinsey, V.L. (1997). *The criminal recidivism process*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.