

SUMMARY OF PhD DISSERTATION

University of Miskolc
Faculty of Law
Deák Ferenc Doctoral School of Law
Central European Comparative Law Programme

CRIMINOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF RECIDIVISM: ON THE ETIOLOGY, PHENOMENOLOGY AND POTENTIAL PREVENTION OF REOFFENDING

Candidate: **Lea Feuerbach**
Supervisor: **Prof. Anna-Maria Getoš Kalac**
Head of the Doctoral School: **Prof. Erika Róth**

Miskolc
2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I. SUMMARY OF THE RESEARCH TASK

1. Background and Significance of the Research
2. The Research Problem
3. Aim and Objectives of the Research
4. Research Questions and Hypotheses

PART II. BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE CONDUCTED RESEARCH, METHODS AND RESOURCES

1. Overall Research Design
2. Theoretical, Literature and Doctrinal Research
3. Analysis of Penal Policy and Legal Frameworks
4. Secondary Data Collection and Analysis
5. Primary Empirical Research
6. Data Analysis
7. Methodological Challenges and Limitations

PART III. BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE SCIENTIFIC RESULTS AND THEIR POSSIBLE PRACTICAL APPLICATION

1. Scientific Results Concerning the Concept and Measurement of Recidivism
2. Scientific Results Concerning Existing Research on Recidivism
3. Scientific Results Concerning Penal Policy Responses to Recidivism
4. Scientific Results of the Comparative Normative Analysis
5. Scientific Results from Secondary Data
6. Scientific Results from the Empirical Research Among Incarcerated Individuals
7. Results of Hypothesis Testing
8. Possible Practical Application of the Results

PART IV. LIST OF THE PUBLICATIONS RELATED TO THE THESIS

PART I. SUMMARY OF THE RESEARCH TASK

1. Background and Significance of the Research

Recidivism represents one of the central and most persistent challenges of criminology, criminal law, penology and criminal justice policy. The repetition of criminal behaviour raises fundamental questions concerning the causes of offending, the effectiveness of punishment, the possibilities of rehabilitation and resocialisation, and the capacity of criminal justice systems to prevent future offending. Although repeat offending has been recognised and addressed throughout the historical development of criminal justice systems, there is still no universally accepted understanding of what constitutes recidivism or how it should be measured.

The significance of recidivism extends beyond the individual offender. High levels of reoffending may indicate limitations in the effectiveness of criminal sanctions, rehabilitation programmes, prison systems and post-release support. At the same time, recidivism is frequently used as an indicator of the effectiveness of criminal justice interventions. However, its interpretation depends substantially on how it is defined and measured. Recidivism may refer to rearrest, reconviction, reincarceration or the repetition of criminal behaviour more broadly. These different approaches may produce substantially different results and therefore limit the comparability of research findings and official statistics. The study of recidivism is consequently inherently multidisciplinary. Understanding recidivism requires consideration of both individual and structural factors, as well as the legal and institutional contexts within which offending and reoffending occur. Research on recidivism has identified a broad range of factors associated with reoffending, including criminal history, early contact with the criminal justice system, substance addiction, socio-economic disadvantage, unemployment, inadequate education, family and social circumstances, mental health difficulties and barriers to successful reintegration. At the same time, research increasingly emphasises that preventing recidivism cannot be understood exclusively through the characteristics of offenders. Structural conditions, including access to employment, housing, education, health care and social support, may also significantly influence the opportunities available to individuals following their release.

Despite the substantial international body of research on recidivism, important conceptual and methodological difficulties remain. Differences in definitions, observation periods, data collection procedures and criminal justice systems complicate comparisons between countries. This issue is particularly significant in comparative research, where apparently similar statistical indicators may represent fundamentally different phenomena. Consequently, meaningful comparative analysis requires careful examination not only of recidivism rates themselves but also of the definitions and methodological procedures underlying their production. The Croatian context provides a particularly relevant setting for examining these issues. While recidivism is recognised as an important criminological and criminal justice phenomenon, systematic empirical research remains comparatively limited, and available data are affected by conceptual and methodological challenges. The present research therefore addresses recidivism through an integrated approach that combines theoretical and conceptual

analysis, literature review, comparative normative analysis, secondary statistical data and original empirical research among incarcerated individuals in Croatia.

The significance of the research lies in its attempt to connect these different dimensions of recidivism. By examining the conceptual and methodological foundations of recidivism, comparing legal and data collection approaches across selected Central and Southeast European countries, and investigating the characteristics and experiences of incarcerated individuals in Croatia, the dissertation seeks to contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of the etiology, phenomenology and potential prevention of reoffending.

2. The Research Problem

The central research problem addressed in this dissertation concerns the difficulty of developing a coherent and empirically meaningful understanding of recidivism across different legal, criminological and institutional contexts. Although recidivism is widely used in criminological research and criminal justice policy, there is no single universally accepted definition of the concept. Depending on the purpose of the research or the institutional context, recidivism may be measured through rearrest, reconviction, reincarceration or other indicators of repeated criminal behaviour. These differences create significant methodological challenges and may substantially affect the interpretation of recidivism data. A particular problem arises in cross-national comparisons. Countries may report data that are described as recidivism statistics while relying on different definitions, observation periods, populations and data collection procedures. Consequently, differences between reported recidivism rates may reflect methodological variation rather than actual differences in patterns of reoffending. Without examining the underlying definitions and methods used to produce the data, direct statistical comparisons may therefore be misleading.

The research problem also concerns the limited availability of comprehensive knowledge regarding the etiology and phenomenology of recidivism in Croatia. International research has identified numerous factors associated with repeat offending, but the extent to which these findings correspond to the characteristics and experiences of incarcerated individuals in Croatia requires further empirical examination. In particular, early contact with the criminal justice system and substance addiction have been repeatedly identified as potentially important factors associated with later reoffending and require examination within the Croatian context. A further dimension of the research problem concerns the prevention of recidivism. Criminal justice responses to repeat offending have traditionally included more severe punishment and sentencing consequences for individuals with prior convictions. However, the effectiveness of punitive responses alone in reducing reoffending remains uncertain. Successful prevention may depend on a combination of individual and structural conditions, including personal motivation and responsibility, family and social support, treatment of addiction, employment opportunities, housing, education, health care and the reduction of social stigma.

The research therefore addresses a broader question concerning how recidivism should be understood, measured and prevented. It examines the relationship between methodological approaches and the comparability of recidivism data, investigates selected factors associated with repeat offending among incarcerated individuals in Croatia, and explores prisoners' perceptions regarding the factors that may be most important in preventing future offending.

3. Aim and Objectives of the Research

The dissertation combines theoretical, normative, comparative and empirical approaches in order to examine recidivism as a complex phenomenon shaped by individual characteristics, social circumstances, criminal justice practices and methodological approaches to measurement. A further aim of the research is to conduct a comparative analysis of recidivism in Croatia and selected countries of Central and Southeast Europe, namely Serbia, Hungary, Romania, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia. Particular attention is given to differences in the definitions of recidivism and variations in data collection procedures. The research examines whether these methodological differences enable meaningful comparisons of recidivism data or whether they limit the validity of cross-national comparisons.

The research also aims to contribute to a better understanding of the etiology of recidivism in Croatia by examining selected factors associated with repeat offending. Particular attention is given to the relationship between early contact with the criminal justice system and subsequent reoffending, as well as to the relationship between drug addiction and recidivism. In addition, the research adopts a lived experience perspective by examining the views of incarcerated individuals regarding the conditions and factors that may contribute to preventing recidivism. This approach seeks to provide insight into the practical challenges of resocialisation and reintegration from the perspective of individuals directly affected by imprisonment and the criminal justice system. Particular attention is given to the distinction between systemic factors, such as employment, housing, education, therapy, mental health care and social acceptance, and personal factors, including family and social support, successful addiction treatment, acceptance of responsibility, motivation for change and the ability to manage emotions and impulsive behaviour.

The principal objectives of the research are therefore:

1. To examine the historical, theoretical and conceptual foundations of recidivism and the different criminological, normative and penological approaches to repeat offending.
2. To analyse existing international and Croatian research on recidivism and identify the principal findings, methodological challenges and gaps in the literature.
3. To examine contemporary penal policy responses to recidivism and the different approaches through which prior offending may influence criminal sentencing.
4. To conduct a comparative normative analysis of the regulation and treatment of recidivism in Croatia and selected countries of Central and Southeast Europe.
5. To examine differences in the definitions and measurement of recidivism and assess their implications for the comparability of cross-national data.
6. To analyse available secondary data concerning prison populations, probation and recidivism indicators in the selected countries.
7. To investigate selected sociodemographic, personal and criminal history characteristics of incarcerated individuals in Croatia and their relationship with recidivism.
8. To examine the relationship between early arrest and subsequent reoffending.
9. To examine the relationship between substance addiction and recidivism.
10. To explore prisoners' perceptions of systemic and personal factors relevant to the prevention of recidivism.

11. To formulate evidence-based policy recommendations aimed at improving approaches to the prevention of reoffending, rehabilitation and reintegration.

4. Research Questions and Hypotheses

In accordance with the overall aim and objectives of the dissertation, the research is guided by three principal research questions.

Research Question 1: How do recidivism definitions differ across Central European countries, namely Croatia, Serbia, Hungary, Romania, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia, and to what extent do these definitional differences, together with variations in data collection processes, enable or preclude valid comparisons of recidivism data?

This question addresses the conceptual and methodological foundations of comparative recidivism research. It examines whether differences in definitions, indicators and data collection procedures allow reported recidivism data to be meaningfully compared across jurisdictions.

Research Question 2: How are early arrest and drug addiction related to recidivism?

This question examines two factors that have frequently been associated with repeat offending in criminological research. It investigates whether individuals who came into contact with the criminal justice system at an early age are more likely to reoffend and whether drug addiction occurs more frequently among recidivists than among non-recidivists.

Research Question 3: Which factors do prisoners consider crucial for preventing recidivism?

This question examines the perspectives of incarcerated individuals regarding the prevention of future offending. It distinguishes between systemic factors, including employment, housing, education, therapy, mental health care and social acceptance, and personal factors, including family and social support, successful addiction treatment, responsibility, motivation for change and emotional and behavioural self-management.

Based on the theoretical framework, previous research and the objectives of the empirical study, four hypotheses were formulated:

Hypothesis 1: Methodological heterogeneity in recidivism definitions and data collection protocols between Croatia and the selected regional comparators, namely Serbia, Hungary, Romania, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia, precludes statistically valid cross-jurisdictional comparisons of recidivism data.

Hypothesis 2: Individuals who were arrested before the age of 18 are more likely to reoffend.

Hypothesis 3: The frequency of drug addiction is higher among recidivists than among non-recidivists.

Hypothesis 4: Prisoners perceive systemic factors as more important than personal factors in preventing recidivism.

Together, these research questions and hypotheses address the principal dimensions of the dissertation: the methodological challenges of defining and comparing recidivism, selected factors associated with repeat offending and the conditions considered important for preventing future criminal behaviour. The research is designed to integrate comparative, theoretical and empirical perspectives to provide a comprehensive basis for understanding recidivism and developing evidence-based approaches to its prevention.

PART II. BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE CONDUCTED RESEARCH, METHODS AND RESOURCES

1. Overall Research Design

The research was designed as a mixed-methods and multilevel study combining quantitative, qualitative, comparative and documentary-analytical approaches to examine recidivism as a complex criminological phenomenon. The research integrates individual, institutional and systemic levels of analysis and combines primary empirical research with secondary statistical, legal and documentary sources.

The overall research design reflects the multidisciplinary nature of recidivism. The study combines theoretical and conceptual analysis of the phenomenon, a review of international and Croatian literature, an examination of penal policy responses, comparative normative analysis, secondary statistical analysis and original empirical research among incarcerated individuals in Croatia. These approaches were used complementarily to provide a comprehensive analysis of the etiology and phenomenology of recidivism and its potential prevention.

2. Theoretical, Literature and Doctrinal Research

The theoretical and conceptual component of the research examined the historical development, theoretical foundations and different approaches to recidivism. The analysis addressed the evolution of responses to repeat offending and the changing purposes of punishment, as well as the principal criminological theories relevant to understanding criminal behaviour and reoffending.

Special attention was devoted to the conceptual complexity of recidivism and the differences between criminological, normative and penological approaches. The research examined related concepts, including reoffending, rearrest, reconviction and reincarceration, and analysed how the meaning and measurement of recidivism depend on the purpose of the analysis and the institutional context in which the concept is applied.

The literature review included international and Croatian scholarship on recidivism. It examined previous research concerning sentencing and correctional practices, resocialisation and treatment approaches, predictors and risk factors of reoffending and the principal findings of international research. The domestic literature review included relevant Croatian scholarship

and available research indexed in CROSB, together with additional literature addressing recidivism within the Croatian context.

The review of the literature served to identify the principal findings, recurring patterns, methodological limitations and research gaps relevant to the present study. Particular attention was given to differences in research design, definitions and measurement approaches, as these factors substantially affect the interpretation and comparability of research findings.

3. Analysis of Penal Policy and Legal Frameworks

The research included an analysis of contemporary penal policy responses to recidivism. The analysis of penal policy examined different approaches to the relevance of prior offending in sentencing decisions. These included the flat-rate model, under which punishment is determined primarily according to the seriousness of the current offence; the recidivist sentencing premium model, under which prior offending results in harsher punishment; the progressive loss of mitigation model; and more lenient approaches to repeated offending. The analysis considered the normative foundations and practical implications of these approaches, particularly in relation to proportionality, deterrence, public protection and the effectiveness of punishment.

The comparative normative analysis focused on Croatia and selected countries of Central and Southeast Europe, namely Serbia, Hungary, Romania, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia. National criminal justice systems and legal frameworks were examined through relevant legislation, official documents and scholarly literature. The analysis considered the historical and contemporary development of recidivism regulation, the legal consequences attached to prior offending and differences in national approaches to the definition and treatment of recidivism. Particular attention was given to the implications of these differences for comparative research and the interpretation of recidivism statistics.

4. Secondary Data Collection and Analysis

Secondary data were collected from official national and international sources to provide a broader institutional and comparative context for the study of recidivism. National sources included official statistical offices and relevant prison and criminal justice reports from Croatia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Serbia. The research used data and reports from the Croatian Bureau of Statistics, the Hungarian Central Statistical Office, Statistics Poland, the National Institute for Statistics of Romania, the Statistical Office of the Slovak Republic, the Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia and the Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia, together with corresponding national institutional reports. International sources included Eurostat and the Council of Europe SPACE statistics. These sources provided information relevant to prison populations, prison capacity, overcrowding, probation and other characteristics of national criminal justice systems.

The analysis of secondary data focused particularly on prison population indicators, probation data and available indicators of recidivism. Rather than treating officially reported recidivism

rates as directly comparable statistical measures, the research examined the definitions, populations, observation periods and data collection procedures underlying the available data. This approach was particularly important because the comparative analysis demonstrated substantial methodological heterogeneity between jurisdictions. National legal definitions, statistical practices and administrative procedures frequently differed, meaning that apparently similar recidivism indicators could refer to different phenomena. Secondary data were therefore used both to examine national patterns and to identify the methodological limitations affecting cross-national comparisons.

5. Primary Empirical Research

Primary data were collected through a structured questionnaire distributed among incarcerated individuals in five Croatian prison institutions: Zagreb Prison, Glina Penitentiary, Lepoglava Penitentiary, Turopolje Penitentiary and Lipovica-Popovača Penitentiary. A total of 1,200 questionnaires were distributed. The questionnaire examined socio-demographic, criminological and psychosocial characteristics, including criminal history, recidivism, drug addiction, early contact with the criminal justice system and factors relevant to the prevention of reoffending. Open-ended questions provided qualitative data concerning participants' perceptions of the advantages and disadvantages of the prison system. Participation was voluntary and anonymous, and the research was conducted with the approval of the relevant Croatian authorities.

6. Data Analysis

Quantitative questionnaire data were entered and analysed using the statistical software Jamovi. The analysis was conducted in several stages and included descriptive and inferential statistical procedures. Descriptive statistical analysis was used to examine the frequencies and distributions of the principal socio-demographic, personal and criminological characteristics of the participants. Response frequencies were also analysed for variables measured using the four-point Likert scale to identify dominant patterns in participants' perceptions. The relationship between recidivism and selected categorical variables was examined using Chi-square tests of independence based on 2×2 contingency tables. These analyses were used to examine the relationship between recidivism status and early arrest, as well as the relationship between recidivism and drug addiction. A paired-samples t-test was used to examine whether a statistically significant difference existed between participants' assessments of the relative importance of personal and systemic factors in preventing recidivism. The qualitative responses to the open-ended questions were analysed thematically to identify recurring themes concerning the perceived advantages and disadvantages of the prison system. The qualitative findings complemented the quantitative results by providing additional insight into prisoners' experiences and perceptions. The findings from the primary research were interpreted alongside the results of the comparative normative analysis, literature review and secondary statistical data.

7. Methodological Challenges and Limitations

The research was subject to several methodological limitations concerning the definition and measurement of recidivism, the availability and comparability of secondary data, sample accessibility and representativeness, self-report bias and qualitative data. The principal conceptual challenge was the absence of a universally accepted definition of recidivism. Different jurisdictions and studies use indicators such as rearrest, reconviction and reincarceration, often with different observation periods and target populations. Consequently, recidivism rates reported by different countries cannot automatically be treated as equivalent or directly comparable. The primary empirical research was affected by limitations concerning access to the prison population and the definition of the target population. Individuals in pre-trial detention, juvenile offenders and young adults subject to separate legal frameworks were excluded. Furthermore, precise and current data on the total number and institutional distribution of adult prisoners were not fully available, limiting the assessment of sample representativeness. The voluntary nature of participation may also have resulted in self-selection bias, meaning that the findings cannot be fully generalised to the entire incarcerated population in Croatia.

The use of self-reported data introduced the possibility of recall bias, socially desirable responses and strategic reporting. Although participation was anonymous and confidentiality was emphasised, participants may nevertheless have perceived their responses as connected to the prison system. The qualitative component was additionally limited by variations in the depth and quality of responses to open-ended questions and the interpretative nature of qualitative coding. Secondary data were also affected by differences in national definitions, legal frameworks, reporting practices and levels of aggregation. Similar indicators may represent different populations or institutional practices, while incomplete reporting and differences in reporting periods and administrative procedures further limited cross-national comparability. Linguistic and script-related differences in national sources also presented challenges for interpretation and verification.

Despite these limitations, the combination of theoretical, normative, comparative, quantitative and qualitative approaches, together with the use of multiple data sources, strengthened the overall research design and enabled the findings to be interpreted within their respective methodological and institutional contexts.

PART III. BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE SCIENTIFIC RESULTS AND THEIR POSSIBLE PRACTICAL APPLICATION

1. Scientific Results Concerning the Concept and Measurement of Recidivism

The research demonstrates that recidivism is a complex and multidimensional concept for which no universally accepted definition or method of measurement exists. Different legal systems and studies rely on different indicators, including rearrest, reconviction, reimprisonment, and previous convictions, often applying different observation periods and population criteria. The study therefore confirms that recidivism rates from different countries cannot be directly compared without considering the legal, institutional, and methodological context in which they were produced.

The research further establishes the importance of distinguishing between recidivism, reoffending, reconviction, rearrest, and reimprisonment. Greater conceptual and methodological transparency is necessary to ensure that empirical findings are interpreted correctly. In the Croatian context, the absence of a specific statutory definition of recidivism creates additional difficulties for consistent legal application and statistical monitoring.

2. Scientific Results Concerning Existing Research on Recidivism

The review of international and Croatian literature demonstrates that recidivism results from an interaction of individual, social, economic, and institutional factors rather than from a single cause. Key risk factors identified across the literature include previous antisocial behaviour, antisocial peers and attitudes, family problems, low educational and employment opportunities, substance abuse, and certain personality and behavioural characteristics. The research further shows that purely punitive approaches are generally insufficient to reduce reoffending. Evidence-based psychological and behavioural interventions, education, treatment programmes, social support, and effective resocialisation measures provide more promising approaches. Croatian research largely supports these conclusions, while also identifying persistent gaps between formal policy objectives and their practical implementation.

3. Scientific Results Concerning Penal Policy Responses to Recidivism

The analysis demonstrates that the use of previous convictions in sentencing presents a tension between proportionality, individualised punishment, deterrence, and public protection. While most legal systems treat previous offending as relevant to sentencing, automatic or excessive sentence escalation is not supported by strong evidence of reducing recidivism.

The analysis of recidivist sentencing models, including three-strikes policies, indicates that increasingly punitive responses may contribute to higher imprisonment and significant social and financial costs without producing corresponding reductions in crime. The findings therefore support a more balanced approach in which previous convictions are considered, but sentencing remains proportionate, individualised, and connected to the objective of reducing future offending.

4. Scientific Results of the Comparative Normative Analysis

The comparative analysis of Croatia, Hungary, Romania, Poland, Slovakia, Serbia, and Slovenia demonstrates substantial differences in the legal regulation of recidivism despite shared regional and historical characteristics. Some jurisdictions provide detailed statutory definitions and mandatory sentencing enhancements, while others rely primarily on judicial discretion or regulate repeat offending indirectly.

Croatia represents a comparatively flexible model, in which previous convictions are considered within the broader assessment of the offender but do not automatically trigger a predetermined increase in punishment. The analysis demonstrates that criminal justice responses to recidivism remain strongly influenced by national legal traditions and policy choices, limiting the possibility of deriving conclusions from normative comparison alone.

5. Scientific Results from Secondary Data

The analysis of secondary data for 2013–2023 shows that prison populations, prison capacity, occupancy, probation use, and recidivism indicators developed differently across the examined countries. No uniform regional trend was identified. Some countries reduced overcrowding through increased capacity, while others experienced continuing or renewed pressure on their prison systems. The research also demonstrates substantial differences in the collection and reporting of recidivism data. Consequently, national figures can be useful for identifying domestic developments over time, but they cannot be treated as directly comparable measures of penal effectiveness. This finding confirms the need for greater consistency and transparency in national and international statistical reporting.

6. Scientific Results from the Empirical Research Among Incarcerated Individuals

The primary research provides a micro-level perspective on the characteristics and experiences of incarcerated individuals in Croatia. The findings indicate that recidivism is associated with a combination of criminal history, early contact with the criminal justice system, substance abuse, and broader social and personal circumstances. At the same time, respondents displayed considerable variation in family circumstances, employment, housing, education, and personal attitudes, demonstrating that recidivists do not constitute a homogeneous group.

The qualitative findings further show that prisoners identify both personal and institutional factors as relevant to successful reintegration. Family support, emotional control, responsibility, and readiness to change were among the most highly valued preventive factors. Conversely, overcrowding, inadequate living conditions, limited healthcare, insufficient treatment opportunities, and weak post-release support were identified as significant shortcomings of the prison system.

7. Results of Hypothesis Testing

The statistical analysis confirmed Hypothesis 1, demonstrating that differences in the definition and measurement of recidivism prevent statistically valid cross-country comparisons between Croatia and the selected countries.

Hypothesis 2 was also confirmed, showing a statistically significant association between arrest before the age of 18 and later recidivism. Although the finding does not establish causality, it indicates that early contact with the criminal justice system represents an important marker of increased risk of repeated offending.

Hypothesis 3 was confirmed through the identification of a statistically significant relationship between drug addiction and recidivism. Recidivists reported substantially higher levels of drug addiction than non-recidivists, supporting the importance of substance-use treatment in recidivism prevention.

Hypothesis 4 was not supported. Contrary to the expectation that systemic factors would be considered more important, respondents rated personal preventive factors slightly higher than systemic factors.

8. Possible Practical Application of the Results

The findings have several practical implications for Croatian criminal justice and penal policy. First, recidivism should be measured through clearer and more consistent definitions and reporting standards, allowing changes over time to be monitored more reliably and improving the basis for future comparative research.

Second, the results support strengthening resocialisation and reintegration within prison facility. Particular attention should be given to addiction treatment, mental health services, education, vocational training, and programmes aimed at developing emotional regulation, responsibility, and readiness for behavioural change. Given the importance respondents attached to family support, maintaining and strengthening family relationships should also form an integral part of reintegration planning.

Third, the findings highlight the need to address structural conditions that may undermine resocialisation, particularly overcrowding, staff shortages, inadequate healthcare, and insufficient post-release support. Prison reform should therefore not be limited to increasing capacity but should also improve the quality and accessibility of treatment and reintegration services.

Finally, greater cooperation between prisons, probation services, healthcare and social welfare institutions, and civil society organisations is necessary to ensure continuity of support after release. A more integrated approach combining individual responsibility with appropriate institutional and social support may provide a more effective basis for reducing recidivism than punitive measures alone.

PART IV. LIST OF THE PUBLICATIONS RELATED TO THE THESIS

Getoš Kalac, A.-M., Feuerbach, L. (2023) “On (Measuring) Recidivism, Penal Populism and the Future of Recidivism Research: Neuropenology,” *Godišnjak Akademije pravnih znanosti Hrvatske*, 14(1), 1–28. DOI: 10.32984/gapzh.14.1.1

Feuerbach, L. (2023) “Summary of the International Scientific Conference on “Contemporary Threats to Parental Responsibility. Selected Legal Aspects” Organized by the Central European Academy of the University as Part of the Central European Professors’ Network 2022”, *Godišnjak Akademije pravnih znanosti Hrvatske*, XIV(1), 177–180. DOI: 10.32984/gapzh.14.1.8

Feuerbach, L. (2024) “Criminological Insights into Recidivism Trends in Croatia,” In M. Miličević, I. Stevanović, & Lj. Ilijić (Eds.), *Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference “Life in Prison: Criminological, Penological, Psychological, Sociological, Legal, Security, and Medical Issues”* (219–235). Institute of Criminological and Sociological Research. DOI: 10.47152/PrisonLIFE2024.41

Feuerbach, L. (2024). Prikaz skupa: EUROCRIM 2024, 24. godišnja konferencija Europskog udruženja za kriminologiju "Criminology Goes East", 11.– 14. rujna 2024., Bukurešt, Rumunjska. Zbornik Pravnog fakulteta u Zagrebu, 75(1), 137–141. DOI: 10.3935/zpfz.75.1.5

Feuerbach, L., Skaramuca, D. (2025) "The Role of Artificial Intelligence in Predicting Recidivism," *Conference Proceedings of the 25th Traditional International Scientific Conference of the International Criminal Law Association: "Challenges of International and National Criminal Law"*, DOI: 10.51204/Zbornik_UMKP_25144A

Getoš Kalac, A.-M., Feuerbach, L. (2026) "Small-Scaling Imprisonment in the Balkans – the 'Holy Grail' of Resocialisation?," *Central European Journal of Comparative Law*, 6(2), 127–165. DOI: 10.47078/2025.2.127-165

Feuerbach, L. (2026) "Rehabilitation, Resocialisation, and Reintegration: Addressing Legal and Practical Barriers to Recidivism Prevention in Croatia," *Crimen*, 17(1), 90–111. DOI: 10.5937/crimen2601090F

Feuerbach, L. (2026) "Perspectives on Recidivism Challenges: An Overview of Croatian Justice," *Central European Academy Law Review*.

Feuerbach, L. (forthcoming 2026) "The Impact of Prior Convictions on Sentencing Decisions in Croatia," *Studia Iuridica Auctoritate Universitatis Pécs Publicata*.

Getoš Kalac, A.-M., & Feuerbach, L. (forthcoming) "Sentencing and Imprisonment in Croatia," *In Mapping the Penological Landscape of the Balkans*. Springer Nature.

Feuerbach, L. (forthcoming 2026) "A Case Study of Penal Populism in Croatia", *Law, Identity and Values*.