

DECEMBER 2013

Federal PROBATION

*a journal of correctional
philosophy and practice*

After the Fall: Assessing the Impact of the Great Prison Experiment on Future
Crime Control Policy

By James M. Byrne

Targeting Antisocial Attitudes in Community Supervision Using the EPICS Model:
An Examination of Change Scores on the Criminal Sentiment Scale

By Ryan Labrecque, Paula Smith, Myrinda Schweitzer, Cara Thompson

Use of Engagement Skills in Community Corrections for High-Risk Offenders

By Natalie Pearl, Karyn Milligan, Michael Hall, Mack Jenkins

Exit Status of Probationers and Prison-Bound Offenders in an Electronic Monitoring
Home Detention Program: A Comparative Study

By Sudipto Roy

A Review of Probation Home Visits: What Do We Know?

By Eileen M. Ahlin, Maria João Lobo Antunes, Heather Tubman-Carbone

From the Archives (Federal Probation May-June 1937): Is There a Measure
of Probation Success?

By Bennet Mead

Juvenile Focus

By Alvin W. Cohn

Federal PROBATION

*a journal of correctional
philosophy and practice*

PUBLISHED BY

The Administrative Office of the United States Courts

Judge John D. Bates, *Director*

Matthew G. Rowland, *Chief*
Probation and Pretrial Services Office

Federal Probation ISSN 0014-9128 is dedicated to informing its readers about current thought, research, and practice in corrections and criminal justice. The journal welcomes the contributions of persons who work with or study defendants and offenders and invites authors to submit articles describing experience or significant findings regarding the prevention and control of crime and delinquency. A style sheet is available from the editor.

Federal Probation is published three times yearly in June, September (on a special topic), and December. Permission to quote is granted on the condition that appropriate credit is given the author and *Federal Probation*. For information about reprinting articles, please contact the editor.

Subscriptions to *Federal Probation* are available from the Superintendent of Documents at an annual rate of \$16.50 (\$22.40 foreign). Please see the subscription order form on the last page of this issue for more information.

EDITORIAL STAFF

Nancy Beatty Gregoire, *Executive Editor*
Ellen Wilson Fielding, *Editor*

Federal Probation

Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts
Washington, DC 20544
telephone: 202-502-1651
fax: 202-502-1677
email: Ellen_Fielding@ao.uscourts.gov

Postmaster: Please send address changes to the editor at the address above.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

members

Dan Richard Beto

National Association of Probation Executives
Huntsville, Texas

James Byrne

University of Massachusetts, Lowell
Lowell, Massachusetts

Timothy P. Cadigan

Chesterfield Associates
Rockville, Maryland

Honorable James G. Carr

United States District Court
Toledo, Ohio

Alvin W. Cohn

Administration of Justice Services, Inc.
Rockville, Maryland

Ronald P. Corbett, Jr.

University of Massachusetts, Lowell
Lowell, Massachusetts

Thomas Henry

Seton Hall University
South Orange, New Jersey

Magdeline Jensen

CEO, YWCA of Greater Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Tim Murray

Pretrial Justice Institute
Washington, DC

Honorable David D. Noce

United States District Court
St. Louis, Missouri

Daniel B. Ryan

Justice Solutions Group
Lakeville, Minnesota

Faye Taxman

George Mason University
Fairfax, Virginia

Marie VanNostrand

Senior Consultant, Luminosity, Inc.
St. Petersburg, Florida

THIS ISSUE IN BRIEF

After the Fall: Assessing the Impact of the Great Prison Experiment on Future Crime Control Policy

3

This article summarizes available research on the impact of the increased use of incarceration on crime rates and identifies the effects of incarceration on individual offenders (specific deterrence, rehabilitation effects) and on communities (incapacitation, general deterrence effects). The author then compares crime reduction effects of incarceration-focused strategies to other criminal justice-focused strategies and considers the prospects for future crime control policies that result in improved individual and community-level outcomes.

By James M. Byrne

Targeting Antisocial Attitudes in Community Supervision Using the EPICS Model: An Examination of Change Scores on the Criminal Sentiment Scale

15

This study uses the Criminal Sentiments Scale-Modified (CSS-M), a self-report measure of antisocial attitudes, values, and beliefs related to criminal behavior, to measure changes in antisocial attitudes and values over time as a result of participating in EPICS sessions with community supervision officers.

By Ryan Labrecque, Paula Smith, Myrinda Schweitzer, Cara Thompson

Use of Engagement Skills in Community Corrections for High-Risk Offenders

21

In response to California's passage of Public Safety Realignment-Assembly Bill (AB) 109, post-custody supervision of many offenders sentenced to prison has been shifted from the statewide Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation parole division to county probation departments. Additionally, some offenders who previously would have served a custodial sentence in state prison now serve that time in local jail custody. Through focus groups, the authors examine how the IBIS model of evidence-based supervision being employed by the San Diego County Post Release Offenders division is being integrated into supervision of this expanded population.

By Natalie Pearl, Karyn Milligan, Michael Hall, Mack Jenkins

Exit Status of Probationers and Prison-Bound Offenders in an Electronic Monitoring Home Detention Program: A Comparative Study

26

The author compares probationers and prison-bound offenders placed in an electronic monitoring home detention program to determine whether there was a significant difference between probationers and prison-bound offenders in terms of exit status and, if so, which factors statistically significantly differentiated the exit status of successful participants of the two groups.

By Sudipto Roy

A Review of Probation Home Visits: What Do We Know?

32

The authors highlight the historical importance of home visits as a key element of probation and suggest future avenues to inform the field about their full potential and utility. They first provide an overview of the history of probation, then outline its evolution over the last century to encompass not only low-risk offenders but those at higher risk of recidivism and violating public safety, discussing how home visits are applicable to this population. They conclude with a discussion of the gaps in our knowledge on home visits and suggestions on how to address these gaps in future research.

By Eileen M. Ahlin, Maria João Lobo Antunes, Heather Tubman-Carbone

From the Archives (Federal Probation May-June 1937): Is There a Measure of Probation Success?

38

In 1937, in the first issue of *Federal Probation*, statistician for the Department of Justice Bennet Mead offers thoughts on how to measure probation success.

By Bennet Mead

D E P A R T M E N T S

Juvenile Focus	41
Your Bookshelf on Review	50
Contributors to This Issue	51
Index of Articles and Reviews for 2013	52

The articles and reviews that appear in *Federal Probation* express the points of view of the persons who wrote them and not necessarily the points of view of the agencies and organizations with which these persons are affiliated. Moreover, *Federal Probation's* publication of the articles and reviews is not to be taken as an endorsement of the material by the editors, the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, or the Federal Probation and Pretrial Services System.

After the Fall: Assessing the Impact of the Great Prison Experiment on Future Crime Control Policy

James M. Byrne
Global Centre for Evidence-based
Corrections and Sentencing
Griffith University, and
University of Massachusetts, Lowell

IN THE FOLLOWING article, I summarize the available research on the impact of the increased use of incarceration on crime rates and identify the effects of incarceration on *individual* offenders (specific deterrence, rehabilitation effects) and on *communities*, cities, states, regions, and nations (incapacitation, general deterrence effects). The crime reduction effects of incarceration-focused strategies are then compared to other criminal justice-focused strategies (more policing or more correctional treatment) and to a range of non-criminal justice-focused strategies, such as community-level improvements in poverty, education, treatment services, and health care. Based on this review of the available research evidence, I then examine policy implications regarding more effective uses of both criminal justice-focused and non-criminal justice-focused strategies and consider the prospects for future crime control policies that result in improved individual and community-level outcomes.

The Great Prison Experiment

The decision to send an individual offender to prison represents a critical policy choice with consequences for both offenders and communities that are important to understand. We sanction for a number of different reasons, including punishment, deterrence, rehabilitation, and incapacitation. It is assumed that an *effective* sentencing strategy will achieve these aims and, in the process, improve community safety and foster individual desistance; but if

this is true, then we must also consider the possibility that an *ineffective* sentencing policy will have the opposite effect, resulting in communities that are less safe and offenders who are less likely to desist from crime.

Beginning with the 1964 United States Presidential campaign, the advocacy of “get tough” prison-focused crime control policies as a way to solve the crime problem has been a dominant—and generally successful—political strategy at every level of government (Loo & Grimes, 2004; Finckenauer, 1978). But success as an election strategy may not translate into success as an effective criminal justice policy.¹ Consider the following brief summary of our four-decade experiment in mass incarceration (Stemen, 2007, *Executive Summary*):

In the 1970s the United States embarked on one of the largest policy experiments of the 20th century—the expanded use of incarceration to achieve greater public safety. Between 1970 and 2005, state and federal authorities increased prison populations

by 628 percent. By 2005, more than 1.5 million persons were incarcerated in U.S. prisons on any given day, and an additional 750,000 were incarcerated in local jails. By the turn of the 21st century, more than 5.6 million living Americans had spent time in a state or federal prison—nearly 3 percent of the U.S. population. Having so many people imprisoned over the course of 30 years raises an obvious question: **has this experiment worked?**

The short but definitive answer to this question is that the great prison experiment has failed. First, a sizable amount of research strongly suggests that sentencing an individual to prison—and to longer sentences in particular—does *not* work as a specific deterrent (Nagin, 2010; Nagin, 2013). Second, there is little evidence to support the notion that prisons foster individual offender rehabilitation (Toch, 2005; Tonry, 2013; Byrne & Miofsky, 2009); in fact, recent research strongly suggests that prisons are criminogenic (Bales & Piquero, 2012), an assessment that is reinforced by examining the post-release failure rates of prisoners (Cullen, 2013; Byrne, 2008). Third, prison has been found to have at best only a modest (2–4 percent) general deterrent/incapacitation effect (see, e.g., Spelman, 2005; Levitt, 1996; Durlauf & Nagin, 2011). Even the research identifying modest general deterrent/incapacitation effects has been criticized on methodological grounds (Durlauf & Nagin, 2011). The sole remaining justifications for prison are incapacitation and retribution, but

¹ For a detailed discussion of how crime has been used as a political campaign issue over the last five decades, see Clear & Frost (2013). One of the interesting findings included their review was the realization that the war on crime was not just a response to record-high crime rates; it was at least in part a war on 1960s civil unrest targeting young black males not in the labor force. They point out that in the last three national elections, discussion of crime as a major political campaign issue has been muted at best. This is likely a response to public opinion polls that consistently rank a range of other issues as higher public priorities.

these seem to be an insufficient rationale for current mass incarceration policies, especially when the research on incapacitation effects is critically reviewed (Durlauf & Nagin, 2011), the problem of false positives is considered (Nagin, 2013), and the crime mix of convicted federal, state, and local prisoners is examined (Blumstein, 2011).

It has been argued that the use of *prison-based* sanctions would make communities safer places. This has not proven to be the case, particularly in the small number of communities where crime is the most likely to occur, and where offenders reside before and after their time in prison (Byrne, 2009). As Sampson and Loeffler have documented, "Like the geographically concentrated nature of criminal offending by individuals, a small number of communities bear the disproportionate brunt of U.S. crime policy's experiment with mass incarceration" (2010, p. 20). Putting large numbers of individuals living in poverty-pocket, high-minority-concentration neighborhoods in prison has done little to alleviate the crime problem in these areas; in fact, there is considerable evidence that this strategy increased the level of crime in these communities (Clear & Frost, 2013).

Given the failure of the great prison/mass incarceration experiment, the question becomes: Where do we go from here? Faced with the rising cost of incarceration and a body of empirical research that challenges the continuation of this policy of mass incarceration, there appears to be both broad public and bipartisan political support in many parts of the United States to downsize prisons (Jacobson, 2005) and to spend at least some of the money now allocated to prisons on a new set of crime control policies that will have a larger impact on crime in our communities (Austin et al., 2013; Cullen, 2013), while supporting long-term desistance from crime among individuals (Maruna, 2012).

This strategy has been described broadly as justice reinvestment (Tucker & Cadore, 2003), but there is currently a debate on the nature and extent of this reinvestment strategy, focusing primarily on how best to reallocate resources in order to make communities safer (Austin et al., 2013; Sherman, 2011). Some have advocated for the reallocation of funds within the corrections resource pie, with a greater proportion of funds allocated for individual offender treatment in both institutional and community settings (Taxman, Pattavina, & Caudy, in press), while others argue for increased funding for a broad range of crime

prevention strategies in targeted high-risk/high-crime communities (Austin et al., 2013), including both *criminal justice-focused* strategies based on increasing the number of police in targeted, high-crime areas, and *non-criminal-justice-focused* strategies designed to address the root causes of crime (poverty, education level, inequality, economic opportunity). Before I offer my assessment of these variations on the justice reinvestment theme, it makes sense to examine carefully the research on both the specific and general deterrent effect of incarceration, and then compare the impact of prison to the projected impact of investments in the other strategies—both criminal justice-focused and non-criminal justice focused—being proposed.

The Specific Deterrent Effect of Prison

Recent evaluation research on the impact of incarceration on individual offenders' post-release behavior is summarized in Table 1, which includes a group of studies first identified by Patrice Villettaz and colleagues (2006) in their systematic evidence-based review of the available research on the impact of custodial vs. non-custodial sanctions on offender recidivism. Studies conducted between 1960 and 2002 that met the authors' inclusion criteria were included in their review. A subsequent review of all research on this topic between 2002 and 2013 identified several additional studies and research reviews. The findings from this two-stage review are unequivocal. In terms of specific deterrence effects on *individual* offenders, there is no methodologically rigorous evidence that the experience of incarceration reduces an offender's risk of re-offending upon return to the community. In fact, it appears that when compared to similar groups of offenders placed in one of a range of alternative, non-custodial intermediate sanctions, prisoners actually re-offend at a higher rate. Unfortunately, any definitive statements on the comparative effects of incarceration versus non-incarcerative sanctions await the completion of more and higher-quality research, preferably using experimental designs.

A review of the research from Villettaz and colleagues' (2006) systematic evidence-based review of prison versus community-based sanctions illustrates the current problems facing the evaluation of existing research evidence using "gold"-level scientific review standards, which focus exclusively on the results from RCTs (randomized control trials).

Villettaz et al. (2006) were able to locate only five controlled or natural experiments conducted on custodial versus non-custodial sanctions over a 50-year review period. The researchers concluded that "Although a vast majority of the selected studies show non-custodial sanctions to be more beneficial in terms of re-offending than custodial sanctions, no significant difference is found in the meta-analysis based on four controlled and one natural experiments" (Villettaz et al., 2006, p. 3). Of these five experiments, only three targeted adult offenders. One study that compared prison to probation (Bergman, 1976) showed that probationers fared significantly better. However, a second study comparing prison to community service had mixed results (Killias, Aebi, & Ribeaud, 2000). A third natural experiment comparing the effects of a 14-day prison term to a suspended sentence reported mixed results as well (Van der Werff, 1979).

The conclusions reached in the Villettaz et al. (2006) systematic review focused exclusively on the five experimental studies examined in their meta-analysis, but did not include the other 18 studies they identified as meeting the study's minimum review criteria. (Note that #24, 25, and 26 in Table 1 are more recent studies not included in Villettaz et al.'s 2006 meta-analysis.) Examination of Table 1 reveals that 11 of these 18 studies showed positive effects for a range of non-custodial sanctions, including probation, home confinement, community service, and mandatory alcohol treatment in drunk-driving cases. Only 2 studies showed positive effects for a prison sanction, 1 where prison fared better than electronic monitoring for low-risk offenders (Bonta et al., 2000) and the other where shock incarceration fared better than probation (MacKenzie & Shaw, 1993). The remaining 5 studies (see Table 1) identified no significant differences between experimental (3 prison, 2 shock incarceration) and control (home confinement, probation, community service, and no prison) groups.

A subsequent review of available research findings and reviews conducted in recent years does not suggest that there is new evidence to support the notion that the prison experience has a specific deterrent effect (Cid, 2009; Bales & Piquero, 2012; Spohn, 2007; Durlauf & Nagin, 2011; Nagin, 2010; Nagin, 2013). This research challenges the underlying assumptions of classical and more recent deterrence-based theories of crime used to justify the use of imprisonment for a wide

range of offenders. There is of course a possible caveat. It could be argued that the higher recidivism rates generally reported for prisoners (compared to non-prisoners) do provide evidence that the prison typologies do, in fact, select a target group of convicted offenders who pose a *greater* risk of re-offending than those sentenced to some form of community-based sanction.

It certainly appears that our current corrections system can be described in the following manner: We are better at identifying *risk level* than we are at developing strategies that result in *risk reduction*. However, it is in fact not clear that current sentencing schemes are accurately described as risk-focused, in that many offenders we send to prison are there for punishment purposes, not because they have been identified as high risks to the community. Regardless of an offender's predicted risk level, punishment by use of a prison sanction is imposed in whole or in part as a specific deterrent. Is it possible that the use of this sanction has the opposite effect?

It has been argued that the *prison experience* increases the risk posed by prisoners upon release to the community; indeed, this is the finding reported in two recent studies (Bales & Piquero, 2012; Cid, 2009). The study by Cid (2009) compared two sanctions, prison and suspended sentences, and found that the use of prison increased recidivism risk. A similar finding was reported by Bales and Piquero's comparison of offenders sanctioned to either prison or to Florida's Community Control program. Even after controlling for differences between the two groups (age, sex, race, current offense, prior record) as recommended by Nagin et al. (2009), Bales and Piquero identified a significant criminogenic effect of prison on subsequent offender behavior upon release. However, it is important to note the limitations of the body of research identifying the criminogenic effects of the prison experience. As Bales and Piquero observed, "We did not unpack what it is about imprisonment that produced more crime and alternately what it is about community control that led to less crime after release" (2012, p. 98). While it is clear that we need more high-quality research in this area, there is sufficient evidence supporting the contention that prisons—as currently organized—make offenders worse.

A review of the available research on the impact of the prison experience reveals that classical, deterrence-driven strategies do not have a sound empirical foundation. Prisons not only don't deter, they also appear to make

offenders worse. However, it should also be noted that evidence of positive individual offender change—using a combination of control and treatment—can be found in *both* institutional and community settings (Byrne & Taxman, 2006; Byrne & Pattavina, 1992). Although the reported effect sizes for prison treatment programs are modest (a 10 percent absolute reduction in recidivism), there is reason to anticipate improvements in these effects in prison systems designed to focus more on offender change rather than on short-term offender control (Taxman & Pattavina, 2013; Cullen, 2013; Welsh & Farrington, 2006; MacKenzie, 2006; Byrne & Pattavina, 2007). In other words, *comprehensive assessment-oriented and intensive treatment-focused prisons* may be the appropriate classification for some convicted offenders, but not because there is evidence that the prison experience will deter these individuals from future involvement in crime. Rather, prison may represent the appropriate location (and control level) for the provision of the types of treatment and services targeted to the offender typology being used (e.g., sex offender, drug offender, mentally ill offender, batterer, violent offender, etc.). This is precisely the point being argued by those in favor of downsizing prisons (Jacobson, 2005) and by advocates of prison reform (or rather prison transformation), who argue that we need to replace "bad" control-oriented prisons with "good" change-oriented prisons (Maruna & Toch, 2006; Deitch, 2004; Gibbons & Katzenbach, 2006). These research findings suggest that we need to rethink our prison (in/out) typology focusing on individual offender control concerns rather than on the false promise of specific deterrence. As Durlauf and Nagin (2011, p. 44) recently observed, "The fact that incapacitation might be appropriate for some criminals does not mean that imprisonment needs to be nearly so widespread as it is." Given the research on specific deterrence, it would be hard to disagree with this understated assessment.

One final observation on specific deterrent effects is the fact that "there have been comparatively few studies of the deterrent effects of sentencing enhancements, judged relative to their importance in contemporary crime control policy" (Nagin, 2013, p. 226). Table 2 summarizes the findings from the six studies (five post-Stemen's study review period) identified by Nagin as offering "particularly convincing evidence on the deterrent effect of incarceration" (2013, p. 227). It is unclear, however, why these studies would

be described as constituting convincing evidence. Overall, these studies offer, at best, a mixed bag of findings quite similar—as Nagin himself points out—to a two-decade earlier review by McDowall, Loftin, and Weirsmann (1992) on the impact of mandatory sentence enhancements for gun crimes, which found no deterrent effect.

Of the six studies identified by Nagin (2013), only two reported significant specific deterrent effects associated with the increased certainty of punishment: Weisburd, Einat, and Kowalski (2008) focused on the problem of delinquent fines, while the Kleiman study (2009) examined the problem of drug-test failures. Both of these studies examined the impact of increasing punishment *certainty* on the level of compliance among probationers, and both studies identified significant effects linked directly to the certainty of punishment. Both these studies need to be considered carefully.

Weisburd and colleagues (2008) conducted a randomized field experiment that examined the threatened use of incarceration as a method to induce probationers to pay outstanding fines. Researchers limited their target population to a small subgroup of the probation population with the following characteristics: low risk to recidivate, no substantial drug or alcohol problems, not currently participating in a residential treatment program for substance abuse, no prior arrests for violent or sex crimes, some prior work history, no physical or psychological disabilities that would make employment difficult, and a stable residence. In other words, only the subgroup of probationers who could work to pay off fines, but refused, were targeted for the study. Among this group, there were additional exclusion criteria: Only probationers with at least 12 months of remaining supervision time who were NOT currently involved in a probation program with community service as a component were considered eligible. Even here, they were only placed in the pool of eligible probationers if they "had missed at least 3 months of scheduled payments or were 60% or more in arrears because of missed or partial payments" (Weisburd et al., 2008, p. 15). The initial target population and randomization process involved 228 cases from eight separate New Jersey counties that were placed in one of three groups: a VOP (violation of probation) only group, a VOP plus intensive supervision and community service group (MUSTER: MUST Earn Restitution), and a control group receiving regular probation

TABLE 1.

Characteristics of 23 fully eligible studies identified by Villettaz et al. (2006) and three more recent studies (24, 25, 26)

N	Study Design	Custodial sanction	Non-custodial sanction	Offender type	Standard-limited time served	Specific crime	Follow-up period	Custodial impact
Controlled randomized trials								
1		Placement	Intensive supervision	Juveniles	no	no	24 months	0
2		Prison	Probation	Adults	no	no	12 months	0
3		Prison	Community service	Adults	14 days	no	24 months	0
								0
4		Correction program	Restitution	Juveniles	no	no	22 months	0
Natural experiment								
5		Prison	Suspended sentence	Adults	14 days	no	6 years	0
								0
								0
Matched-pair design studies								
6		Detention	Probation	Juveniles	no	no	5 years	0
7		Prison	Community service	Adults	8 months	no	5 years	0
8		Prison	Probation	Adults	no	no	24 months	0
9		Prison	Home confinement	Adults	no	no	5 years	0
10		Prison	No prison	Adults	no	no	10.5 years	0
Studies with four or more control variables								
11		Probation with institutional treatment	Probation, Conditional prison sentence	Adults	no	no	24–36 months	0
12		Prison	Electronic monitoring and rehabilitation	Adults	no	no	12 months	0
13		Prison	Electronic monitoring and rehabilitation	Adults	no	Low- and high-risk offenders	12 months	0
								1
14		Prison	Non imprisonment	Adults	no	no	36 months	0
15		Prison	Probation	Adults	no	no	Not clearly defined	0
16		Prison	Alcohol treatment and license suspension	Adults	no	Drunk-driving	18 months	0
Studies with four or more control variables								
17		Shock incarceration	Probation	Adults	no	no	24 months	1
18		Shock incarceration	Probation	Adults	no	no	12 months	0
19		Shock incarceration	Probation	Adults	8-State comparison	no	12/24 months	0
20		Prison	Community service	Aboriginal Adults	no	no	3.5 years	0
21		Prison	Probation	Adults	no	no	6–12 months	0
22		Prison	Probation	Adults	no	Drug offenders and others	4 years	0
23		Prison	Alcohol treatment and license suspension	Adults	no	Drunk-driving	24 months	0
24		Prison	Suspended sentence	Adults	No; maximum 3 years	No	8 years	
25		Prison	Community Control	Adults				
26		Prison	Probation	Adults	no	Drug, drug-involved, and nondrug	1–5 years	

Non-custodial impact	Significant effect (p<.05)	Study name
0	n.s.	Barton, W.H., Butts, J.A. (1990) (#10)
1	sig.	Bergman, G.R. (1976) (#91)
0	- n.s., for prevalence and incidence of arrests and convictions,	Killias, M., Aebi, M., Ribeaud, D. (2000) (#25)
1	- sig., improvement before/past arrest rate	
0	n.s.	Schneider, A.L. (1986) (#66)
0	- n.s., for traffic offenders	Van der Werff, C. (1979) (#124)
0	- n.s., for property offenders	
1	- sig., for violent crime offenders	
1	sig.	Kraus, J. (1974) (#76)
1	n.s. (p<.10)	Muiluvuori, M.-L. (2001) (#68)
1	n.s. (p<.10)	Petersilia, J., Turner, S., and Peterson, J. (1986) (#45)
0	n.s.	Smith, L.G., Akers, R.L. (1993) (#74)
0	n.s.	Weisburd, D., Waring, E., Chayet, E. (1995) (#16)
1	sig.	Bondeson, U.V. (1994/2002) (#1002)
1	sig.	Bonta, J., Wallace-Capretta, S., Rooney, J. (2000) (#32)
1	- sig., for high-risk offenders	Bonta, J., Wallace-Capretta, S., Rooney, J. (2000) (#20)
0	- sig., for low-risk offenders	
1	sig.	Börjeson, B. (1996) (#1005)
0	n.s.	Brennan, P.A., Mednick, S.A. (1994) (#23)
1	sig.	DeYoung, D.J. (1997) (#2)
0	sig.	MacKenzie, D.L., Shaw, J.W. (1993) (#31)
1	n.s. (p<.10)	MacKenzie, D.L. (1990) (#56)
0	n.s.	MacKenzie, D.L., Brame, R., McDowall, D., Souryal, C. (1995) (#72)
0	n.s.	Roeger, L.S. (1994) (#64)
1	sig.	Savolainen, J., Nehwadowich, W., Tejaratchi, A., Linen-Reed, B. (2002) (#9)
1	sig.	Spohn, C., Holleran, D. (2002) (#35)
1	n.s. (p<.10)	Tashima, H.N., Marelich, W.D. (1989) (#43)
1		Cid (2009)
1		Bales and Piquero (2011)
1		Spohn (2007)

supervision. Due to an eligibility error, 30 ineligible offenders were originally included in the study, but then subsequently removed, resulting in a final study with 66 VOP cases, 63 MUSTER cases, and 69 regular probation cases. They conducted a six-month follow-up and found that the threat of a violation of probation and the resulting possibility of incarceration had a significant impact on fine payment, with the highest fine repayment levels among probationers that were assigned to the VOP group (39 percent with 100 percent compliance, compared to 34 percent in the MUSTER group, and only 13 percent in control group).

These findings must be considered as preliminary, given the small sample size and the multiple exclusion criteria used to distinguish a subgroup of probationers who were appropriate for this type of intervention. As Weisburd and colleagues point out, "Although our findings strongly support the idea that threats of violation of probation and possible incarceration are a powerful tool for gaining compliance with financial penalties in the courts, they do not mean that such an approach is efficient or cost effective for the criminal justice system" (2008, p. 29). They go on to note that unlike most offenders under probation supervision, "These offenders were people who had the ability to work and often the means to pay financial obligations" (p. 30). Given the low-risk, nonviolent, stable, employment-ready, non-substance-abusing population targeted here, another possible non-incarceration sanction threat may work even better: Threaten to report the failure to pay to the big three credit bureaus. In this study, at least four offenders received some jail time; locking up even a single one of these probationers for failure to pay fines is an incredible waste of resources.

The second study identified by Nagin (2013) was the evaluation of Hawaii's HOPE (Hawaii Opportunity Probation with Enforcement) program, which utilized a combination of drug testing and swift and certain punishments for drug-test failures to increase compliance among substance-abusing offenders on probation. The claims of effectiveness associated with this program are certainly newsworthy, and reminiscent of the claims associated with another swift and certain response strategy, Operation Ceasefire (Kennedy, 2009). Consider the following assessment from one of the two evaluators of the Hawaii HOPE program, Mark Kleiman (2010, p. 120): "In Hawaii, a judicial warning

that the next positive drug test would draw an immediate jail term measured in days succeeded in virtually ending drug use for more than three quarters of a group of chronically defiant felony probationers, most of them methamphetamine users.” As described here, people will stop doing drugs if there are swift and certain responses to drug-test failures; drug treatment is not a necessary feature of this intervention strategy; neither is the threat of a severe sanction (Kleiman, 2010).

When reviewing this study, the first distinction that needs to be made is between the original, large non-experimental study conducted by Hawken and Kleiman (2009), which is available for review on the National Institute of Justice’s (NIJ) website, and the much smaller randomized control trial conducted as a follow-up to the original study, which is included in brief summary form (7 pages) as an Appendix to the NIJ report. It appears that the authors (see, e.g., Kleiman, 2009) and commentators (Nagin, 2013) may misrepresent the findings from the HOPE evaluation, because they jump from discussion of one study to another without emphasizing that due to sample size, target population, and study design differences, these two studies are not interchangeable.

The RCT (randomized control trial) described in the Appendix of the NIJ evaluation includes an overview of the RCT study design and the key findings from this evaluation, which compared compliance rates and selected outcomes for HOPE participants ($n = 330$) and a control group ($n = 163$). One key limitation noted at the outset was that “The RCT used an intent-to-treat design, i.e., all offenders assigned to the HOPE condition were included in the HOPE group, *even if they failed to appear for their warning hearing to formally enter the program (emphasis added)*.” This distinction had important implications for our study, as 30 percent of the offenders who had their probation revoked and were sentenced to an open term under HOPE had never appeared for a warning hearing” (Hawken & Kleiman, 2009, p. 59). Unfortunately, the summary of findings included in the NIJ report does not include any discussion of the implications of this decision and the likely impact on the results presented. The overall findings, including this 30 percent subgroup (who did not receive the “treatment”), were quite positive, and indicated that the HOPE participants had significantly fewer no-shows for probation appointments (9 percent vs. 23 percent), fewer positive urine tests (13 percent

vs. 46 percent), fewer arrests during a one-year follow-up (2 percent vs. 47 percent), fewer revocations (7 percent vs. 15 percent), and less time incarcerated (138 days vs. 267 days). As a result of the original non-experimental study and the subsequent randomized control trial, NIJ is currently funding additional research on the Hawaii HOPE program over a longer follow-up period, but one likely problem with this follow-up research has been identified by Hawken and Kleiman in their non-experimental evaluation, “Due to the high rate of non-compliance in the comparison group, after one year, judges began to transfer comparison probationers to HOPE. By the end of the second year, nearly 40 percent of the probationers were transferred” (2009, p. 49).

In addition to the above-mentioned research on Hawaii’s original HOPE program, NIJ, in conjunction with BJA, is also funding a multi-site replication of the HOPE model—using a randomized control trial—in four separate United States jurisdictions: Clackamas County, Oregon; Essex County, Massachusetts; Saline County, Arkansas; and Tarrant County, Texas. Two of the country’s most respected evaluation researchers, Pam Lattimore from The Research Triangle Institute and Doris MacKenzie from Pennsylvania State University, will conduct the evaluation, which should be completed by 2015. It certainly seems premature to view this research as definitive evidence of combining punishment certainty and celerity to induce probationers to stop using drugs. In fact, the entire focus on formal mechanisms of social control ignores a large body of existing research that supports the contention that informal social control mechanisms are much stronger specific deterrents than formal social control mechanisms (Byrne, 2009).

The General Deterrent and Incapacitation Effect of Prison

The second primary question posed at the outset of this review is whether or not prison has any general deterrent effect. Table 3 was developed by Don Stemen (2007) and included in a review he completed for the VERA Institute of Justice on the impact of incarceration on local, state, and national crime rates. Since this review was completed, a number of other research studies have been completed and critically reviewed, but the substantive findings are unchanged: Prisons have only a modest impact on crime rates (for an overview, see Nagin, 2013).

Stemen’s review of the research on the impact of prison on crime revealed that variation in effect sizes across studies—in particular for the studies looking to demonstrate a general deterrent effect—could be attributed to the following factors:

- how the effectiveness of the prison sentence is to be determined (e.g., impacts on individuals, impacts on neighborhoods, state or national level effects);
- the use of comparison groups and/or comparison policies;
- the criterion measure employed (violent crime, overall crime);
- the statistical procedures, including controls for simultaneity, that were applied; and
- whether cost-effectiveness comparisons were included (money on such alternative crime reduction strategies as improving treatment, the quality of education, early childhood intervention, or employment/anti-poverty initiatives versus money spent on incarcerating an increased number of offenders, in terms of overall crime reduction).

Despite these cross-study differences, Stemen (2007) argued that it is possible to use this body of research to answer the question that policymakers and the general public continually ask: Does prison work as a general deterrent? By focusing on the results of research conducted at different levels of aggregation with, where available, appropriate statistical controls for simultaneity, we begin to see a clearer picture of the general deterrent impact of incarceration (Levitt, 1996; Spelman, 2000; Spelman, 2005). At the *national* level, a 10 percent increase in the rate of incarceration is estimated to result in about a 4 percent decrease in the rate of index crimes, with estimates of the impact on violent crimes between 3.8 and 4.4 percent. Studies (see Table 2) claiming larger reductions in crime (between 9 and 22 percent) using national-level data did not include controls for simultaneity. Based on *state*-level data, a 10 percent increase in the incarceration rate is associated with a decrease in the crime rate between 0.11 and 4 percent. At the *county* level, a 10 percent increase in incarceration is associated with a 4 percent reduction in the crime rate (Stemen, 2007). Thus, as Spelman, Levitt, and others have concluded, America’s incarceration binge has had—at best—only a modest impact on crime rates at the national, state, and local level (note: for a critical review, see Durlauf & Nagin, 2011).

One underlying assumption of general deterrence is that the costs of a particular

prohibited behavior must outweigh the benefits of the action, but only marginally, for an individual to be deterred. There is no assumption that more punishment translates into more compliance with the law. Indeed, too much punishment could have the opposite effect. Two recent studies provide support for this contention, suggesting that there is a “tipping point” for incarceration levels that can be demonstrated at both the state level and the neighborhood level (Liedka, Piehl, & Useem, 2006; Rose & Clear, 1998; Clear, Rose, Waring, & Scully, 2003). Incarceration reduces crime, they argue, but only up to a point. Once the incarceration rate hits a certain level—at the state level this tipping or inflection point appears to be about 325 inmates per 100,000 population—crime rates actually increase (Liedka, Piehl, & Useem, 2006). Although they do not identify a specific neighborhood-level tipping point, Rose and Clear (1998) explain why they believe this also occurs at the local level:

High rates of imprisonment break down the social and family bonds that guide individuals away from crime, remove adults who would otherwise nurture children, deprive communities of income, reduce

future income potential, and engender a deep resentment toward the legal system. As a result, as communities become less capable of maintaining social order through families or social groups, crime rates go up. (Rose & Clear, as summarized by Stemen, 2007, p. 6)

The implication of this research on possible tipping points is not the abandonment of prison as a sanction, but rather greater parsimony in its application. When viewed in this context, it is apparent that definitions of the “in-prison” group were expanded in the 1980s to include “large numbers of nonviolent marginal offenders” (Stemen, 2007, p. 8). Since there is no evidence that this expanded definition had an added effect on crime rates (Zimring & Hawkins, 1997), it makes sense to consider earlier, more restricted definitions of who should be considered for prison, which focused primarily on the identification of serious, violent offenders (Nagin, Cullen, & Jonson (2009).

Other Ways to Reduce Crime and Foster Desistance

It is worth noting that much of the research on general deterrent effects does not include

an examination of various “what if” scenarios. What if we spent the same money used to expand our prison capacity on other strategies designed either as a general deterrent (for example, more police) or as a community-level risk-reduction strategy of investment in education, treatment, employment, housing, health care, or increased wages? According to Stemen (2007), only about 25 percent of the major crime drop that occurred in the United States between 1990 and 2005 appears to be linked directly to our increased use of incarceration. The other 75 percent of the drop can be linked to a variety of other factors, including fewer “at risk” youth in the general population, decrease in crack cocaine markets, lower unemployment rates, higher wages, higher graduation rates, the recent influx of Latino immigrants,² and of course, changes in police strength and arrest tactics (Levitt, 2004; Sampson & Bean, 2006). A review of the research on several of these factors (Stemen, 2007, pp. 9-12) suggests that they are likely to offer more crime reduction benefits than prison expansion does, and at much less cost. Consider the following:

² For a full discussion of what is referred to as the “Latino Paradox,” see Sampson and Bean (2006).

TABLE 2.

Recent Evaluation Studies of Sentencing Enhancements (Nagin, 2013)

Study	Sanction	Method	Outcome
Weisburd, et al., 2008	The use of imprisonment to enforce fine payment	Randomized Control Trial targeting low-risk probationers with ability to pay fines but delinquent	Substantial effects reported with a small subgroup of all probationers, making generalization beyond this group misleading
Hawken, A., and Kleiman, M. (2009); Kleiman, 2009	The use of imprisonment to enforce probation conditions	Randomized Control Trial, targeting drug-involved probationers, but with a significant post-randomization problem noted	Substantial drug use reduction, fewer arrests, and prison use reduction effects reported for HOPE participants; independent multi-site replication study now being conducted
Helland and Tabarrok, 2007	The deterrent effect of California’s Three Strikes Law	Survival Analysis of data from California and 3 states without 3 strikes laws: Illinois, New York, Texas	Modest effect: 17–20% reduction in arrest rates among subgroup of offenders with two strikes, at an estimated cost of \$148,000 per crime avoided
Raphael and Ludwig, 2003	The deterrent effect of sentence enhancements for gun crimes	Estimation of deterrent effects of sentence enhancements for gun crimes	No deterrent effect identified
Hjalmarsson, 2009	Adult jurisdiction and heightened threat of prison	Estimation of deterrent effects based on data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (NLSY97) on perceptions of punishment over time among a cohort of 8984 individuals between 12 and 16 as of Dec. 31, 1996	No deterrent effect: overall, “individuals underestimate the change in punishment severity at the age of criminal majority” (2008, p. 245)
Lee and McCrary, 2009	Adult jurisdiction and heightened threat of prison	Florida sample of youth with at least one felony arrest by age 17	No deterrent effect at age of criminal majority

TABLE 3.

Summary of studies estimating the impact of incarceration rates on crime rates (Source: Stemen, 2007, for all studies 1988–2006; with additional studies 2007–2013 included from a review by Durlauf and Nagin, 2011)

Studies that do not account for simultaneity		
Study	Data	Estimated percentage change in crime rates due to a 10% increase in incarceration rates
Devine, Sheley, and Smith (1988)	National, 1948–1985	-28.4 (violent offenses) -19.9 (property offenses) -22.0 (index offenses)
Marvell and Moody (1997, 1998)	National, 1958–1995	-7.9 (violent offenses) -9.5 (property offenses) -9.3 (index offenses)
Marvell and Moody (1994)	49 states, 1971–1989	-1.6 (index offenses)
Besci (1999)	50 states and D.C., 1971–1993	-0.46 (violent offenses) -0.91 (property offenses) -0.87 (index offenses)
Raphael and Winter-Ebmer (2001)	50 states, 1971–1997	not significant (violent offenses) -1.1 (property offenses)
Donahue and Levitt (2001)	50 states, 1973–1997	not significant (violent offenses) -1.6 (property offenses)
Levitt (2001)	50 states, 1950–1999	-0.76 (property offenses) -1.3 (violent offenses)
DeFina and Arvanites (2002)	50 states and D.C., 1971–1998	not significant (murder, rape, assault, robbery) -1.1 (burglary) -0.56 (larceny) -1.4 (auto theft)
Kovandzic and Sloan (2002)	57 Florida counties, 1980–1998	not significant (index offenses)
Washington State Institute for Public Policy (2003)	39 Washington counties, 1980–2001	-2.4 (index offenses)
Liedka, Piehl, and Useem (2006)	50 states and D.C., 1970–2000	-0.118 (index offenses) (states with incarceration rates <325) +0.05 (index offenses) (states with incarceration rates >325)
Kovandzic and Vieraitis (2006)	58 Florida counties, 1980–2000	not significant (index offenses)
Studies that do account for simultaneity		
Study	Data	Estimated percentage change in crime rates due to a 10% increase in incarceration rates
Levitt (1996)	50 states and D.C., 1971–1993	-3.8 (violent offenses) -2.6 (property offenses)
Spelman (2000)	50 states and D.C., 1971–1997	-4.0 (index offenses)
Spelman (2005)	254 Texas counties, 1990–2000	-4.4 (violent offenses) -3.6 (property offenses)
Additional Studies and Reviews 2006–2013		
Durlauf and Nagin (2011)	Selected Research review	No general deterrent effect identified

(1) **Police:** Levitt (1997) found that a 10 percent increase in the size of a city's *police force* was associated with an 11 percent lower violent crime rate and a 3 percent lower property crime rate (using county-level data); however, other more recent analyses and reviews (Bradford, 2012) suggest that increasing police force size will have no impact on the violent crime rate, and only marginal improvement (1–3%) in property crime rates.

(2) **Employment:** According to several studies (Levitt, 1996; Levitt, 1997; Raphael & Winter-Ebmer, 2001; Gould et al., 2002), a 10 percent decrease in the state's *unemployment* rate corresponded with a 10–16 percent reduction in property crime, but had no effect on violent crime (state and county-level data);

(3) **Income:** a 10 percent increase in *real wages* was associated with a 13 percent lower index crime rate, a 12 percent lower property crime rate, and a 25 percent lower crime rate at the national level (Gould et al., 2002); state-level analyses identified a 16 percent lower violent-crime rate (Raphael and Winter-Ebmer, 2001); and individual-level analyses reveal that a 10 percent increase in real wages is associated with a 10 percent decrease in crime participation (Grogger, 1998);

(4) **Education:** a one-year increase in the average *education* level of citizens resulted in a 1.7 percent lower index crime rate, while a 10 percent increase in graduation rates resulted in a 9.4 percent reduction in the index crime rate and a 5–10 percent reduction in arrest rates, through the increased wages associated with graduation (Lochner & Moretti, 2004, as summarized by Stemen, 2007, pp. 9–12).

While the link between police strength (more police per capita), arrest levels (more arrests, especially for public-order offenses) and subsequent reductions in crime is certainly consistent with deterrence-based strategies, few research studies have compared the crime-reduction effects of criminal justice-focused and noncriminal justice-focused strategies. It seems clear from our brief review that research on the general deterrent effect of incarceration needs to be examined and its effects compared to other possible criminal justice-focused strategies, such as strategies designed to increase certainty and celerity. However, these criminal justice-focused strategies are only one piece of a much larger puzzle, and they need to be considered in the broader context of the wide range of non-deterrence-based social policy changes

that may achieve the greater crime reduction effects at a fraction of the cost.

After the Fall: New Directions in Crime Control Policy

As Robert Sampson and Charles Loeffler pointed out in a recent essay, “Incarceration in the United States is now so prevalent that it has become a normal life event for many disadvantaged young men, with some segments of the population more likely to end up

in prison than attend college” (2010, p. 20). In the aftermath of the dual crisis of confidence in both our economic and mass incarceration policies, there is a search for alternatives among both liberals and conservatives across the United States. One emerging crime control strategy that is currently being embraced across the political aisle comes immediately to mind: justice reinvestment. However, it is becoming increasingly clear that the term justice reinvestment has different meanings, both

within and across countries (Homel, 2014). In the United States, there are essentially three justice reinvestment strategies that have been proposed to date:

1. A *treatment investment* strategy, which would increase the level and quality of treatment provided in both institutional and community corrections systems at the federal, state, and local level (Taxman & Pattavina, 2013; Farrington & Welsh, 2007);
2. A *police investment* strategy, which would increase the certainty of apprehension by increasing the size of the police force in targeted, high-crime communities, and by shifting “the focus of the police from people to places” (Weisburd, 2011, 159); and
3. A *community investment* strategy, which would focus on reallocating corrections resources currently expended on prisons to a variety of crime prevention strategies, including strategies focused on addressing the root causes of crime in targeted high-risk communities (Homel, 2014; Farrington & Welsh, 2007; Welsh & Farrington, 2012; Farrington, 2013).

Each of these strategies of justice reinvestment has empirical support and each strategy should be considered carefully. Side-by-side comparisons of the known crime reduction effects of these strategies need to be conducted, both in terms of individual change/desistance from crime, and community safety. Before the relative merits of these three variations on the justice reinvestment strategy can be assessed, we need to know much more than we do about the potential impact of these policies on both offenders and communities.

Consider for example the notion that we should allocate more resources within corrections for offender treatment, both in prison and in the community. We can identify the effects of this strategy on cohorts of offenders (see, e.g., the recent simulation modeling research by Taxman & Pattavina, 2013, and the recent review by Cullen, 2013), but we know very little, if anything, about the impact of this type of treatment investment strategy on crime rates in the targeted high-risk communities where most offenders reside (Byrne, 2009).

Similarly, the recent proposals by Sherman (2011), Weisburd (2011), and Nagin (2013) to increase the proportion of all criminal justice spending designated for policing need to be informed by research on the impact of this spending shift, not only on community crime rates, but also on community residents’ perceptions of the police. In this regard, Michael

TABLE 4.

Summary of studies 1996-2004 estimating the impact of other criminal justice and non-criminal justice/social factors on crime rates (Source: Stemen, 2007)

<i>Police per capita</i>		
Study	Data	Estimated percentage change in crime rates due to a 10% increase in indicator
Marvell and Moody (1996)	56 U.S. cities, 1971-1992	-3 (index offenses)
Marvell and Moody (1996)	49 states, 1971-1992	not significant (index offenses)
Levitt (1997)	59 U.S. cities, 1970-1992	-11 (violent offenses) -3 (property offenses)
Kovandzic and Sloan (2002)	57 Florida counties, 1980-1998	-1.4 (index offenses)
<i>Unemployment rate</i>		
Study	Data	Estimated percentage change in crime rates due to a 10% increase in indicator
Levitt (1996)	50 states and D.C., 1971-1993	not significant (violent offenses) 10 (property offenses)
Levitt (1997)	59 U.S. cities, 1970-1992	not significant (violent offenses) 10.4 (property offenses)
Raphael and Winter-Ebmer (2001)	50 states, 1971-1997	not significant (violent offenses) 16.3 (property offenses)
Gould et al. (2002)	705 counties, 1979-1997	not significant (violent offenses) 16.6 (property offenses)
<i>Real wages</i>		
Study	Data	Estimated percentage change in crime rates due to a 10% increase in indicator
Gould et al. (2002)	705 counties, 1979-1997	-25.3 (violent offenses) -12.6 (property offenses) -13.5 (index offenses)
Raphael and Winter-Ebmer (2001)	50 states, 1971-1997	-1.6 (violent offenses) not significant (property offenses)
Grogger (1998)	Individual survey data (1980)	-10 (index offenses)
<i>Unemployment rate</i>		
Study	Data	Estimated percentage change in crime rates due to a 10% increase in indicator
Lochner and Moretti (2004)	50 states, 1960, 1970, 1980	-9.4 (index offenses)

Tonry (2010, p. 321) has offered the following cautionary assessment: "It is not entirely obvious to me, however, that increased expenditures to enable more intensive policing would be a good thing. Zero tolerance, public order, and misdemeanor policing have notoriously increased the extent of racial profiling and compromised traditional civil liberties restraints on police interactions with citizens." Elliot Currie (2011) has also weighed in on this issue, suggesting that the question of criminal justice resource allocation/reallocation is too narrowly framed: "A good crime policy... cannot simply weigh how much to put into prisons versus police, but also must consider how much of either merits our investment versus, for example, family support programs, job creation, and much more" (Currie, 2011, p. 112).

Examination of the research on the impact of various non-criminal justice factors on community crime rates can be divided into two categories: 1) research on the implementation and impact of various community crime prevention strategies (see, e.g., Welsh & Farrington, 2012 for a detailed review); and 2) research on the community context of crime that links changes in various community-level factors (such as education level, poverty level, income inequality, size of immigrant population, racial concentration, housing stock, and health care) to increases and declines in the rate of violent and property crime (Kirk & Laub, 2010; Sampson, 2013; Lounsbury & Western, 2010). However, we need to know much more about the impact of both targeted community crime-prevention strategies and broader, general community-change strategies (gentrification, relocation, economic redevelopment, and community activism) on changes in crime rates (Kreager, Lyons, & Hays, 2011; Leventhal & Brooks-Gunn, 2011; Papachristos, Smith, Scherer, & Fugiero, 2011).

Conclusion

We have conducted a nearly four-decade-long experiment with mass incarceration, and the results from this experiment point to the need to move in a different direction. But we need to do so carefully, based on a full assessment of alternative strategies and an objective review of high-quality research (Weisberg & Petersilia, 2010). It certainly makes sense to weigh the relative impact of both criminal justice-focused and noncriminal justice-focused strategies on public safety in targeted, high-risk communities. Before we move further in the development of justice reinvestment strategies, we need to examine the available

research and develop crime-control policies based on a comparative assessment of a full range of individual- and community-change strategies. We cannot focus narrowly on only those strategies within the criminal justice system (e.g., more police or more treatment). As Elliot Currie has observed:

Once the focus is restricted to variations within different strategies of control and punishment, the discourse has shifted away from the social, familial, economic, and communal sources that drive the crime problem to begin with. It is not accidental that the rise of such narrow approaches to cost-benefit analysis tends to coincide temporally with the relative abandonment of social approaches to reducing crime and their displacement by a growing reliance on the criminal justice system. (2011, p. 112)

It seems likely that the great prison experiment is over in most, if not all, regions of the United States. However, it is too soon to tell whether we have learned anything useful from this experiment that can improve community safety and support long-term desistance from crime in targeted high-risk communities.

References

- Austin, J., Cadora, E., Clear, T., Dansky, K., Greene, J., Maurer, M., Porter, N., Tucker, S., Young, M., & Gupta, V. (2013, April). *Ending mass incarceration: Charting a new justice re-investment*. Retrieved from http://sentencingproject.org/doc/publications/sen_Charting%20a%20New%20Justice%20Reinvestment.pdf
- Bales, W., & Piquero, A., (2012). Assessing the impact of imprisonment on recidivism. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 8, 71-101.
- Barton, W.H., & Butts, J.A. (1990). Viable options: Intensive supervision programs for juvenile delinquents. *Crime and Delinquency*, 36(2), 238-256.
- Bergman, G.R. (1976). *The evaluation of an experimental program designed to reduce recidivism among second felony criminal offenders*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan (77-9368).
- Besci, Z. (1999). Economics and crime in the states. *Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta Economic Review, First Quarter*, 39-56.
- Blumstein, A. (2011). Approaches to reducing both imprisonment and crime. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 10(1), 93-102.
- Bondeson, U.V. (1994). *Alternatives to imprisonment: Intentions and reality*. London/Boulder: Transaction Publishers/Westview Press, 2002/1994.
- Bonta, J., Wallace-Capretta, S., & Rooney, J. (2000). A quasi-experimental evaluation of an intensive rehabilitation supervision program. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*, 27(3), 312-329.
- Börjeson, B. (1996). *Om påföljders verkningar (On the effects of sanctions). En undersökning av prognosen för unga lagöverträdare efter olika slag av behandling*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Bradford, B. (2011). Police numbers and crime rates—a rapid evidence review, <http://www.hmic.gov.uk/media/police-numbers-and-crime-rates-rapid-evidence-review-20110721.pdf>, July 2011.
- Brennan, P.A., & Mednick, S.A. (1994). Learning theory approach to the deterrence of criminal recidivism. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 103(3), 430-440.
- Byrne, J. (2008). The social ecology of community corrections: Understanding the link between individual and community change. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 7(2), 263-274.
- Byrne, J. (2009). *Maximum impact: Targeting supervision on higher risk people, places, and times*. Washington, D.C.: Pew Charitable Trusts.
- Byrne, J., & Miofsky, K. (2009). From preentry to reentry: An examination of the effectiveness of institutional and community-based sanctions. *Victims & Offenders* 4(4), 348-356.
- Byrne J., & Taxman, F. (2006). Crime control strategies and community change. *Federal Probation*, 70(3), 3-12.
- Byrne, J., & Pattavina, A. (1992). The effectiveness issue: Assessing what works in the adult community corrections system. In J. Byrne, A. Lurigio, and J. Petersilia (Eds.), *Smart sentencing: The emergence of intermediate sanctions* (pp. 281-306). Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications.
- Byrne, J.M., & Pattavina, A. (2007). Institutional corrections and soft technology. In J.M. Byrne and D.J. Rebovich (Eds.), *The new technology of crime, law and social control*. Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.
- Cid, J. (2009). Is imprisonment criminogenic? A comparative study of recidivism rates between prison and suspended prison sanctions. *European Journal of Criminology* 6(6), 459-480.
- Clear, T., & Frost, N. (2013). *The punishment imperative: The rise and failure of mass incarceration in America*. New York: NYU Press.
- Clear, T. R., Rose, D.R., Waring, E., & Scully, K. (2003). Coercive mobility and crime: A preliminary examination of concentrated incarceration and social disorganization. *Justice Quarterly*, 20(1), 33-64.
- Cullen, F. (2013). Rehabilitation: Beyond nothing works. In M. Tonry (Ed.) *Crime and justice in America: 1975-2025* (pp. 299-376). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Currie, E. (2011). On the pitfalls of spurious prudence. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 10(1), 109-114.
- Defina, R.H., & Arvanites, T.M. (2002). The weak effect of imprisonment on crime: 1971-1998. *Social Science Quarterly*, 53, 407-420.
- Deitch, M. (2004). Thinking outside the cell: prison reform litigation and the vision of prison reform. *Pace Law Review*, 24(2), 847-855.
- Devine, J.A., Sheley, J.F., & Smith, M.D. (1988). Macroeconomic and social-control policy influences on crime rate changes, 1948-1985. *American Sociological Review*, 53, 407-420.
- DeYoung, D.J. (1997). An evaluation of the effectiveness of alcohol treatment, driver license actions and jail terms in reducing drunk driving recidivism in California. *Addiction*, 92(8), 989-997.
- Donahue, J.J., & Levitt, S.D. (2001). The Impact of Legalized Abortion on Crime. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 116(2), 379-420.
- Durlauf, S., & Nagin, D. (2011). Imprisonment and crime: Can both be reduced? *Criminology and Public Policy*, 10(1), 13-54.
- Farrington, D. (2013). Longitudinal and experimental research in criminology. In M. Tonry (ed.), *Crime and justice in America: 1975-2025* (pp.453-527). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Farrington, D., & Welsh, B. (2005). Randomized Experiments in Criminology: What Have We Learned in the Last Two Decades? *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 1, 1-29.
- Farrington, D., & Welsh, B. (2007). *Saving children from a life of crime: Early risk factors and effective interventions*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Finckenauer, J. (1978). Crime as a national political issue: 1964-76—From law and order to domestic tranquility. *Crime and Delinquency*, 24, 13-27.
- Gibbons, J. J., & Katzenbach, N.d.B. (2006). *Confronting confinement: A report of the commission on safety and abuse in America's prisons*. Vera Institute of Justice, New York, NY. Available at: http://www.vera.org/sites/default/files/resources/downloads/Confronting_Confinement.pdf
- Gould, E.D., Weinberg, B.A., & Mustard, D.B. (2002). Crime rates and local labor market opportunities in the United States: 1979-1997. *Review of Economic and Statistics*, 84(2), 45-61.
- Grogger, J. (1998). Market wages and youth crime. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 16(4), 756-791.
- Hawken, A. (2010). Behavioral triage: A new model for identifying and treating substance-abusing offenders. *Journal of Drug Policy Analysis*, 3, 1-5.
- Hawken, A. and Kleiman, M. (2009). Managing drug involved probationers with swift and certain sanctions: Evaluating Hawaii's HOPE. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Hellend, E., & Tabarrok, A. (2007). Does three strikes deter? A nonparametric estimation. *Journal of Human Resources*, 42(2), 309-330.
- Hjalmarrsson, R. (2009). Crime and expected punishments: Changes in perceptions at the age of majority. *American Law and Economics Review*, 7, 209-248.
- Homel, R. (2014, in press). Justice reinvestment as a global phenomenon. *Victims and Offenders: An International Journal of Evidence-based Research, Policy, and Practice*.
- Jacobson, M. (2005). *Downsizing prisons*. New York: New York University Press.
- Kennedy, D. (2009). *Deterrence and crime prevention: Reconsidering the prospect of sanction*. New York, N.Y.: Routledge.
- Killias, M., Aebi, M., & Ribeaud, D. (2000). Does community service rehabilitate better than shorter-term imprisonment?: Results of a controlled experiment. *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, 39(1), 40-57.
- Kirk, D., & Laub, J. (2010). Neighborhood change and crime in the modern metropolis. In M. Tonry (Ed.), *Crime and justice: A review of research* (pp. 441-502). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kleiman, M. (2009). *When brute force fails: How to have less crime and less punishment*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Kleiman, M. (2010). Toward fewer prisoners and less crime. *Daedalus: Journal of the American Academy of Arts & Sciences*, Summer, 115-123.
- Kovandzic, T.V., & Sloan, J. (2002). Police levels and crime rates revisited: A county-level analysis from Florida (1980-1998). *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 30, 65-76.
- Kovandzic, T.V., and Vieraitis, L.M. (2006). The effect of county-level prison population growth on crime rates. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 5(2), 213-244.
- Kraus, J. (1974). A comparison of corrective effects of probation and detention on male juvenile offenders. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 25(2), 130-138.
- Kreager, D., Lyons, C., & Hays, Z. (2011). Urban revitalization and Seattle crime, 1982-2000. *Social Problems*, 58(4) 615-639.
- Lee, D.S., & McCrary, J. (2009). *The deterrent effect of prison: Dynamic theory and evidence*. Princeton, NJ: University of Princeton, Industrial Relations Section.
- Leventhal, T., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2011). Changes in neighborhood poverty from 1990 to 2000 and youth's problem behaviors. *Developmental Psychology*, 47(6), 1680-1698.
- Levitt, S. (1996). The effect of prison population size on crime rates: Evidence from prison overcrowding litigation. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 11(2), 319-352.
- Levitt, S.D. (1997). Using electoral cycles in police hiring to estimate the effect of police on crime. *American Economic Review*, 87(3), 270-290.
- Levitt, S.D. (2001). Alternative strategies for identifying the link between unemployment and crime. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 17(4), 377-390.
- Levitt, S. (2004). Understanding why crime rates fell in the 1990's: Four factors that explain the decline and six that do not. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 18(1), 163-190.
- Liedka, R., Piehl, A., & Useem, B. (2006). The crime control effect of incarceration: Does scale matter? *Criminology and Public Policy*, 5(2), 245-276.
- Lochner, L., & Moretti, E. (2004). The effect of education on crime: Evidence from prison inmates, arrests, and self-reports. *American Economic Review*, 94(1).
- Loo, D., & Grimes, R.E. (2004). Polls, politics, and crime: The law and order issue of the 1960s. *Western Criminology Review*, 5(1), 50-67.
- Loury, G., & Western, B. (2010). The challenge of mass incarceration in America. *Daedalus: Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, Summer, 5-7.
- MacKenzie, D.L. (1991). The parole performance of offenders released from shock incarceration (boot camp prisons): A survival time analysis. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 7(3), 213-236.
- MacKenzie, D.L. (2006). *What works in corrections: Reducing the criminal activities of offenders and delinquents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MacKenzie, D.L., Brame, R., McDowall, D., & Souryal, C. (1995). Boot camp prisons and recidivism in eight states. *Criminology*, 33(3), 327-358.
- MacKenzie D.L., & Shaw, J.W. (1993). The impact of shock incarceration on technical violations and new criminal activities. *Justice Quarterly*, 10(3), 463-487.
- MacKenzie, D.L., & Shaw, J.W. (1990). Inmate adjustment and change during shock incarceration. *Justice Quarterly*, 7125-150.
- Maruna, Shadd (2012). Elements of successful desistance signaling. *Criminology and Public Policy* 11(1), 73-86.
- Maruna, S., & Toch, H. (2005). The impact of incarceration on the desistance process. In J. Travis and C. Visher (Eds.), *Prisoner reentry and public safety in America*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Marvell, T.B., & Moody, C.E. (1994). Prison population growth and crime reduction. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 10, 109-140.

- Marvell, T.B., and Moody, C.E. (1996). Specification Problems, Police Levels, and Crime Rates. *Criminology* 34(4): 609-646.
- Marvell, T.B., & Moody, C.E. (1997). The impact of prison growth on homicide. *Homicide Studies*, 1, 205-233.
- Marvell, T.B., & Moody, C.E. (1998). The impact of out-of-state prison population on state homicide rates: Displacement and free rider effects. *Criminology*, 36, 513-535.
- McDowall, D., Loftin, C., & Weirsmann, B. (1992). A comparative study of the preventive effects of mandatory sentencing laws for gun crimes. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 83, 378-394.
- Muiluvuori, M.L. (2001). Recidivism among people sentenced to community service in Finland. *Journal of Scandinavian Studies in Criminology and Crime Prevention*, 2(1), 72-82.
- Nagin, D. (2013). Deterrence in the twenty-first century. In M. Tonry (Ed.), *Crime and justice in America: 1975-2025* (pp. 199-264). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Nagin, D. (2010). Imprisonment and crime control: Building evidence-based policy. In R. Rosenfeld, K. Quinet, and C. Garcia (Eds.), *Contemporary issues in criminological theory and research: The role of social institutions* (pp. 309-315). Belmont, Ca: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Nagin, D., Cullen, F., & Jonson, C. (2009). Imprisonment and reoffending. In M. Tonry (Ed.) *Crime and justice: A review of research, volume 38* (pp. 115-200). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Papachristos, A., Smith, C., Scherer, M., & Fugiero, M. (2011). More coffee, less crime? The relationship between gentrification and neighborhood crime rates in Chicago, 1991-2005. *City & Community*, 10(3), 215-240.
- Petersilia, J., Turner, S., & Peterson, J. (1986). Prison versus probation in California: Implications for crime and offender recidivism.
- Raphael, S., & Ludwig, J. (2003). Prison sentence enhancements: The case of project exile. In J. Ludwig, P.J. Cook (Eds.) *Evaluating gun policy: Effects of crime and violence*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- Raphael, S., & Winter-Ebmer, R. (2001). Identifying the effect of unemployment on crime. *Journal of Law and Economics*, 44, 259-283.
- Roeger, L.S. (1994). The effectiveness of criminal justice sanctions for Aboriginal offenders. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 27(3), 264-281.
- Rose, D. R., & Clear, T.R. (1998). Incarceration, social capital, and crime: Implications for social disorganization theory. *Criminology*, 36, 441-480.
- Sampson, R.J. (2013). The place of context: A theory and strategy for criminology's hard problems. *Criminology*, 51(1), 1-31.
- Sampson, R.J., & Bean, L. (2006). Cultural mechanisms and killing fields: A revised theory of community-level racial inequality. In R. Peterson, L. Krivo, and J. Hagen (Eds.), *The many colors of crime: Inequalities of race, ethnicity, and crime in America* (pp. 8-36). New York: New York University Press.
- Sampson, R.J., & Loeffler, C. (2010). Punishment's place: The local concentration of mass incarceration. *Daedalus*, Summer, 20-31.
- Savolainen, J., Nehwadowich, W., Tejaratchi, A., & Linen-Reed, B. (2002). *Criminal recidivism among felony-level ATI program participants in New York City*. New York: New York City Criminal Justice Agency.
- Schneider, A.L. (1986). Restitution and recidivism rates of juvenile offenders: Results from four experimental studies. *Criminology*, 24(3), 533-552.
- Sherman, L. (2011). Al Capone, the sword of Damocles, and the police-corrections budget ratio: Afterword to special issue. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 10(1), 195-205.
- Smith, L.G., & Akers, R.L. (1993). A comparison of recidivism of Florida's community control and prison: A five-year survival analysis. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 30(3), 267-292.
- Spelman, W. (2000). What recent studies do (and don't) tell us about imprisonment and crime. *Crime and Justice*, 27, 419-494.
- Spelman, W. (2005) Jobs or jails? The crime drop in Texas. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 24, 133-165.
- Spohn, C. (2007). The deterrent effect of imprisonment and offenders' stakes in conformity. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 18(1), 31-50.
- Spohn, C., & Holleran, D. (2002). The effect of imprisonment on recidivism rates of felony offenders: A focus on drug offenders. *Criminology*, 40(2), 329-357.
- Stemen, D. (2007). *Reconsidering incarceration: New directions for reducing crime*. New York: Vera Institute of Justice.
- Tashima, H.N., & Marelich, W.D. (1989). *A comparison of the relative effectiveness of alternative sanctions for DUI offenders*. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Taxman, F., & Pattavina, A. (2013). *Simulation strategies to reduce recidivism: Risk, need, responsivity (RNR) modeling for the criminal justice system*. New York: Springer.
- Taxman, F., Pattavina, A., & Caudy, M. (in press). Justice reinvestment in the United States: An empirical assessment of the potential impact of increased correctional programming on recidivism. *Victims and Offenders: An International Journal of Evidence-based Research, Policy, and Practice*, 8(1).
- Toch, H. (2005). Reinventing prisons. In A. Liebling, and S. Maruna (Eds.), *The effects of imprisonment* (pp. 465-473). Portland, Oregon: Willan Publishing.
- Tonry, M. (2010). Less imprisonment, less crime: A reply to Nagin. In R. Rosenfeld, K. Quinet, and C. Garcia (Eds.), *Contemporary issues in criminological theory and research: The role of social institutions* (pp. 317-329). Belmont, Ca: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Tonry, M. (2013). Sentencing in America: 1975-2025. In M. Tonry (Ed.), *Crime and justice in America: 1975-2025* (pp.141-198). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Tucker, S.B., & Cadora, E. (2003). *Justice reinvestment*. New York: Open Society Institute.
- Van der Werff, C. (1979). *Speciale preventie*. Den Haag, NL: WODC.
- Villetta, P., Killias, M., & Zoder, I. (2006). *The effects of custodial vs. non-custodial sentences on re-offending: A systematic review of the state of the evidence*. Available from the Campbell Collaborative URL: <http://www.campbellcollaboration.org/doc-pdf/Campbell-report-30.09.06.pdf>
- Washington State Institute for Public Policy. (2003). *The criminal justice system in Washington: Incarceration rates, taxpayer costs, crime rates, and prison economics*. Olympia, W.A.: Washington State Institute for Public Policy.
- Weisberg, R., & Petersilia, J. (2010). The dangers of pyrrhic victories against mass incarceration. *Daedalus: Journal of the American Academy of Arts & Sciences*, Summer: 124-133.
- Weisburd, D., Einat, T., & Kowalski, M. (2008). The miracle of the cells: An experimental study of interventions to increase payment of court-ordered financial obligations. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 7, 9-36.
- Weisburd, D. (2011). Shifting crime and justice resources from prisons to police: Shifting police from people to places. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 10(1), 153-164.
- Weisburd, D., Waring, E., & Chayet, E. (1995). Specific deterrence in a sample of offenders convicted of white-collar crimes. *Criminology*, 33(4), 587-607.
- Welsh, B., & Farrington, D. (Eds.). (2006). *Preventing crime: What works for children, offenders, victims, and places*. New York: Springer.
- Welsh, B., & Farrington, D. (Eds.) (2012). *The Oxford handbook of crime prevention*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Zimring, F., & Hawkins, G. (1997). *Crime is not the problem: Lethal violence in America*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Targeting Antisocial Attitudes in Community Supervision Using the EPICS Model: An Examination of Change Scores on the Criminal Sentiment Scale

Ryan M. Labrecque
 Paula Smith
 Myrinda Schweitzer
 Cara Thompson
 University of Cincinnati

AT THE PRESENT time, more than 50 meta-analyses of the correctional treatment literature have been undertaken (see McGuire, 2013). The results have been replicated with remarkable consistency, and the core findings are collectively referred to as the *principles of effective intervention* in reducing offender recidivism (see Andrews & Bonta, 2010, for a detailed review). Until recently, these concepts have not been widely applied in community supervision settings, despite the fact that probation is one of the most widely used sanctions in the criminal justice system. In fact, early reviews of the literature on the effectiveness of community supervision have found that there is little evidence to support the contention that it produces greater reductions in offender recidivism than other alternative sanctions (Bonta, Rugge, Scott, Bourgon, & Yessine, 2008; Bonta et al., 2011). To illustrate, Bonta et al. (2008) conducted a meta-analysis of 15 studies and reported that probation was associated with only a 2 percent reduction in general recidivism, and had no impact on violent recidivism. Similar findings have been reported from the research on the effectiveness of parole (Solomon, 2006; Solomon, Kachnowski, & Bhati, 2005) as well as other empirical studies examining supervision or surveillance of offenders in the community (Sherman et al., 1997; MacKenzie, 2006; Petersilia, 1998; Petersilia & Turner, 1993). As a consequence, Bonta et al. (2008) concluded that traditional community supervision often

focuses on compliance monitoring and law enforcement aspects of supervision.

In response to this research, several recent initiatives have been undertaken to apply the principles of effective intervention in parole and probation settings (Bonta et al., 2011; Bourgon, Gutierrez, & Ashton, 2012; Latessa, Smith, Schweitzer, & Labrecque, 2012; Robinson et al., 2012; Smith, Schweitzer, Labrecque, & Latessa, 2012; Taxman, Yancey, & Bilanin, 2006; Trotter, 1996; 2006). Specifically, these models of intervention have attempted to apply the principles of risk, need, and responsivity (RNR) within the context of individual case management meetings between probation/parole officers and offenders. The Strategic Training in Community Supervision (STICS) model was developed by the Canadian Department of Public Safety, and represented the first attempt to apply an RNR framework to a model of community supervision. Research on use of the STICS model has been very promising. For example, researchers found that after training officers in the model, they had a 12 percent higher retention rate at six months when compared to officers that were not trained (Bonta et al., 2011). Additionally, recidivism rates were 15 percent lower for offenders who were supervised by an officer using the STICS model in comparison with offenders who were supervised by untrained officers after a two-year follow-up period (Bonta et al., 2011).

A similar model was developed at the University of Cincinnati called Effective

Practices in Community Supervision (EPICS). The goal of the EPICS model is similar to the goal of STICS in that it emphasizes the importance of targeting higher-risk offenders, teaches officers how to target criminogenic needs using a structured manner, and teaches officers how to adhere to a cognitive-behavioral approach during meetings. Furthermore, this model trains community supervision officers on several core correctional practices related to service delivery with offender populations and includes a structured approach to coaching and fidelity monitoring. A series of recent investigations have found that training in the EPICS model makes officers more likely to consistently use core correctional practices in their interactions with clients compared to officers that are not trained in the model (Labrecque, Schweitzer, & Smith, 2013b; Latessa et al., 2012; Smith et al., 2012). In addition, offenders supervised by EPICS-trained officers have also been shown to have lower recidivism rates than offenders supervised by untrained officers (Latessa et al., 2012).

One of the primary purposes of EPICS sessions is identifying and changing the antisocial attitudes of higher-risk offenders during individual contact sessions. Strong empirical evidence links antisocial attitudes or beliefs—or procriminal sentiments—to criminal behavior (Andrews & Bonta, 2010; Gendreau, 1996; Gendreau, Goggin, Chanteloupe, & Andrews, 1992; Gendreau, Little, & Goggin, 1996; Hubbard & Pratt, 2002; Leschied, Chiodo, Nowicki, & Rodger, 2008; Simourd &

Andrews, 1994). This dynamic risk factor for criminal behavior holds particular importance for practitioners in the field of corrections, because it can be targeted for change through interventions and services (see Andrews & Bonta, 2010; Gendreau et al., 1996; Liao, Barriga, & Gibbs, 1998; Palmer, 2007). This study will examine the success of the EPICS model in targeting and changing antisocial attitudes, which have been recognized as one of the most robust predictors of criminal behavior (Andrews & Bonta, 2010).

In the empirical literature, there is no consensus about basic terminology or how antisocial attitudes should be classified or grouped (Andrews & Bonta, 2010). To illustrate, antisocial attitudes and beliefs have been referred to as cognitive distortions (Barriga & Gibbs, 1996; Gibbs, 1993; Gibbs, Potter, & Goldstein, 1995), thinking errors (Samenow, 1984; Yochelson & Samenow, 1976), and neutralizations (Sykes & Matza, 1957). Regardless of the specific terminology used, each of these labels implies the presence of a thought process that supports criminality, in that interpretations of situations serve to justify or endorse specific criminal behaviors (Barriga, Landau, Stinson, Liao, & Gibbs, 2000; Dodge, 1993). Research has demonstrated that these distorted thought processes are likely important precursors to the development and maintenance of antisocial behaviors, aggression, and delinquency (Barriga et al., 2000; Barriga, Hawkins, & Camelia, 2008; Barriga, Morrison, Liao, & Gibbs, 2001). Egan, McMurrin, Richardson, and Blair (2000) describe these cognitive distortions as the "over-valuing of self-centered attitudes and thoughts that entitle an offender to behave in a deviant manner" (p.171). In other words, these cognitive distortions point to a belief that individuals feel entitled to engage in whatever behaviors they wish, regardless of how it affects others (Wallinius, Johansson, Larden, & Dernevik, 2011). Furthermore, these neutralizations or distortions may include denying the existence of any harms or victims associated with offending behavior, appealing to higher loyalties (e.g., gangs), and condemning one's condemners. In this regard, various neutralizations may be employed to justify or excuse criminal behavior and frame it in such a way as to avoid stigmatization or criminal labels normally associated with antisocial acts.

The result of this empirical literature has been the proliferation of assessment tools and curricula designed for correctional

practitioners to first identify and then modify antisocial attitudes and other criminogenic needs with the goal of reducing recidivism among known offender populations. One such instrument is the Criminal Sentiments Scale-Modified (CSS-M; Simourd, 1997). The CSS-M is a specific self-report measure of antisocial attitudes, values, and beliefs related to criminal behavior that has been used with a number of different offender populations (Andrews & Wormith, 1984; Simourd, 1997). Research suggests that this instrument possesses adequate psychometric properties, as well as construct and predictive validity for the populations on which they have been tested (Shields & Simourd, 1991; Simourd, 1997; Simourd & Olver, 2002; Simourd & Van De Ven, 1999; Witte, Di Placido, Gu, & Wong, 2006). Since antisocial attitudes have been found to be strong predictors of recidivism for both adolescents and adults, many practitioners have begun utilizing the CSS-M questionnaire as an assessment for treatment planning purposes. Many agencies also administer the instrument pre- and post-treatment to assess individual client progress in treatment as well as overall programmatic performance in reducing risk to re-offend through addressing antisocial attitudes. This study uses the CSS-M questionnaire to measure changes in antisocial attitudes and values over time as a result of participating in EPICS sessions with community supervision officers.

Method

Participants

The participants in this study came from one of four regional juvenile and adult probation or parole departments in one large Midwestern state. The caseloads of 37 probation and parole officers were involved in this study. Officers were randomly assigned to one of two groups by a site coordinator: (1) a trained group (i.e., trained in the EPICS model) and (2) an untrained group (i.e., untrained in the EPICS model). The sample consisted of selected offenders supervised by the probation and parole officers in the study ($n = 238$). Only probationers and parolees who were at moderate- or high-risk for recidivism and fluent in English were eligible to participate in the study. Sex offenders and individuals diagnosed with a severe mental illness were excluded in the study due to their status as special populations.

Data Collection

Data was collected on an ongoing basis by University of Cincinnati Corrections Institute (UCCI) staff (i.e., officer and offender demographics, offender views and feedback, and other offender case information). Sites also provided access to pertinent offender files and officer information.

Measures

EPICS Officer Training. All of the probation and parole officers assigned to the trained group attended a three-day training on the EPICS model. University of Cincinnati Corrections Institute (UCCI) staff facilitated the training. The primary objective of the training was to provide officers with a sound understanding of the model and its implementation in offender-officer contact sessions. The format of the training included visual presentations, demonstrations of skills, workbook and participation exercises, and several opportunities for officers to practice skills. Following the initial training, officers and supervisors participated in 24 coaching sessions (approximately one per month). Coaching sessions were led by UCCI staff and were designed to refresh officers on the EPICS model.

Criminal Sentiments Scale-Modified (CSS-M). The CSS-M is a modified version of the original Criminal Sentiments Scale (CSS; Andrews & Wormith, 1984). The CSS-M is a 41-item offender-completed questionnaire that requires offenders to rate their agreement with general statements on a 3-point Likert scale (i.e., agree, uncertain, or disagree). Statements can be prosocial or antisocial depending on the content and wording. Each endorsement of an antisocial statement (or rejection of a prosocial one) yields 2 points, whereas each rejection of an antisocial statement (or acceptance of a prosocial one) yields 0 points. Undecided responses receive a score of 1. Given the scoring scheme, higher scores are indicative of higher levels of antisocial attitudes than lower scores. Offenders receive an overall score as well as ratings on three dimensions. The first sub-scale, Attitudes towards the Law, Courts, and Police (LCP, 25 items), evaluates respect for the law and the criminal justice system. The second sub-scale, Tolerance for Law Violations (TLV, 10 items), explores rationalizations for criminal behavior. The third subscale, Identification with Criminal Others (ICO, 6 items), assesses offenders' opinions of law violators.

As part of the research design, probation and parole officers had participating offenders

complete a CSS-M during the first contact session (pretest) and then again during the final contact session (posttest) so that any change in criminal attitudes could be measured. There were a total of 359 CSS-M assessments turned in for analysis (238 pretests and 121 posttests).

Change in Score. The change in CSS-M score was dichotomized where a positive change indicated a reduction in criminal sentiment (lower score at post-test than at pre-test) and a negative change indicated a similar or increased criminal sentiment (same or higher score at post-test than at pre-test).

Recidivism. Recidivism is operationalized here in the following two ways: (1) any technical violations of community supervision (0 = no and 1 = yes), and (2) any arrest for a new crime (0 = no and 1 = yes). Technical violations include, but are not limited to, failing to refrain from the use or possession of drugs or alcohol, failing to report as instructed, or failing to complete treatment as ordered by the court. The average time of follow-up was 329 days.

Analysis

The analyses of this study proceed in the following four steps. First, descriptive statistics compare the officers and offenders in the trained group with those in the untrained group on a number of theoretically relevant variables. Second, the CSS-M pre-test scores of the offenders in the trained group are compared to the offenders in the untrained group. Third, bivariate relationships between CSS-M pre-test scores and recidivism are examined. Finally, chi-square analyses examine the effect of offender group assignment on the direction of CSS-M change in score from pre-test to post-test.

Results

Table 1 shows the frequencies and percentages of the 37 participating probation and parole officers by gender, race, and years of service. Generally speaking, the officers in the study were predominately white and approximately half were male. While the officers in the trained group had slightly more years of service (10.8 years) compared to the untrained officers (10.2 years), the difference was not significant.

Table 1 also displays the frequencies and percentages of the 238 participating offenders by gender, race, marital status, age, and number of prior arrests. The majority of the offenders were not married and just about half of the sample is white. The offenders in both groups are approximately 31 years old with 11

TABLE 1.
Demographic Characteristics of Participants by Officer Training Status

Characteristic	Trained		Untrained	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
	<i>n</i> = 17		<i>n</i> = 20	
Officers				
Male	8.0	47.1	10.0	50.0
White	16.0	94.1	17.0	85.0
Mean years of service (<i>SD</i>)	10.8	5.1	10.2	4.6
	<i>n</i> = 120		<i>n</i> = 118	
Offenders				
Male*	106.0	88.3	91.0	77.1
White	58.0	48.3	62.0	51.7
Married ^a	12.0	10.1	17.0	14.4
Mean age (<i>SD</i>)	31.0	9.1	31.9	10.3
Mean prior arrests ^b (<i>SD</i>)	10.2	8.0	11.6	10.6

Note: * $p \leq .05$; ^a $n = 237$; ^b $n = 232$.

prior arrests. The only significant difference between the two groups is that the offenders supervised by trained officers were significantly more likely to be male ($\chi^2 = 5.2$, $df = 1$, $p = .022$). However, despite this gender difference, the majority of both offender groups are males (88.3 percent of the trained group and 77.1 percent of the untrained group).

Table 2 shows that there were no statistically significant differences between the CSS-M pre-test scale scores of the trained ($n = 120$) and untrained group ($n = 118$). This finding indicates that both groups of offenders were similar in the amount of criminal sentiments at the start of the study. This increases the probability that any changes in criminal attitudes at post-test were due to the treatment condition (i.e., EPICS or control) and reduces the likelihood that the changes are a result of pre-existing group differences in levels of criminal attitude.

To investigate if there was a statistically significant association between CSS-M pre-test scale scores and recidivism, Pearson correlations were computed. Table 3 shows that the Identification with Criminal Others (ICO) scale is significantly related ($p < .01$) to both technical violations ($r = .20$) and any arrest for a new crime ($r = .18$). This means that offenders who identified more with criminal others were more likely to recidivate compared to offenders who identified less with criminal others. The total CSS-M score and the other two domains of Attitudes towards the Law, Courts, and Police (LCP) and Tolerance for Law Violations (TLV) were not statistically related to either measure of recidivism. However, it should be noted that the direction of the relationships between these measures and recidivism was positive, which suggests that higher scores on all three scales indicate a higher probability for recidivism.

TABLE 2.
Comparison of CSS-M Pre-Test Scores by Group Type ($n = 238$)

Scale	Trained		Untrained		<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>				
LCP	15.4	7.8	16.4	8.2	.96	236	.340	-.13
TLV	5.7	3.6	5.8	3.7	.16	236	.876	-.03
ICO	4.1	2.0	4.0	1.9	-.59	236	.555	.05
Total	25.3	11.3	25.8	12.1	.37	236	.713	-.04

TABLE 3.
Bivariate Correlations between CSS-M Pre-Test Scores and Recidivism

Scale	Technical Violation		Arrest New Crime	
	<i>r</i>	95% CI	<i>r</i>	95% CI
LCP	.02	[-.11, .15]	.06	[-.07, .19]
TLV	.10	[-.03, .22]	.00	[-.13, .13]
ICO	.20	[.08, .32]	.18	[.05, .30]
Total Score	.07	[-.06, .20]	.08	[-.05, .21]

Note. *r* = Pearson product moment correlation; CI = confidence interval.

To investigate whether offenders supervised by EPICS-trained officers differ from offenders supervised by non-trained officers on the direction of their post-test CSS-M assessment scores, a chi-square statistic was conducted. Table 4 shows the Pearson chi-square results and indicates that offenders were significantly different on Identification with Criminal Others ($\chi^2 = 3.68$, $df = 1$, $p = .055$) and Tolerance for Law Violators ($\chi^2 = 2.92$, $df = 1$, $p = .087$). Offenders supervised by trained officers were more likely to have positive (reduced) scores at post-test on the ICO and TLV scales. Phi, which indicates the strength of association between the two sets of variables, is .18 for the ICO scale and .16 for the TLV scale.

Discussion

The extant research on the predictors of criminal behavior indicates that antisocial attitudes and beliefs is a valid and reliable

predictor of recidivism (Andrews & Bonta, 2010; Gendreau, 1996; Gendreau, Goggin, Chanteloupe, & Andrews, 1992; Gendreau et al., 1996; Hubbard & Pratt, 2002; Leschied et al., 2008; Simourd & Andrews, 1994). This study sought to determine if the CSS-M, an assessment designed to measure antisocial attitudes and beliefs, is a valid predictor of technical violations and rearrest in a sample of probationers and parolees. This study also sought to determine if officer training in the EPICS model was associated with decreases in the levels of offender antisocial thinking and attitudes as evidenced by fluctuations in CSS-M scores.

The results of this study provide some tentative support for the effectiveness of the CSS-M in predicting offender outcomes (Shields & Simourd, 1991; Simourd, 1997; Simourd & Olver, 2002; Simourd & Van De Ven, 1999; Witte et al., 2006). One of the main findings of this study is that the

Identification with Criminal Others (ICO) subscale of the CSS-M was statistically associated with both technical violations ($r = .20$) and rearrest ($r = .18$). Although the other two domains of Attitudes towards the Law, Courts, and Police (LCP) and Tolerance for Law Violators (TLV) and the total CSS-M score were not found to be statistically associated, all three non-significant measures were in the hypothesized direction. The statistical non-equivalence is likely a result of the small sample size and limited number of assessments examined. Nevertheless, this study involved a strong methodological design, with probation and parole officers randomly assigned to treatment conditions (i.e., either trained or untrained in the EPICS model). It should also be noted that the two groups of officers were similar to each other in the theoretically relevant variables examined, which adds to the internal validity of the study and suggests that the differences found are a result of the treatment condition and not any pre-existing officer characteristics. Taken together, these findings lend support for the CSS-M as an effective tool for identifying those offenders more likely to recidivate.

This study provides additional support for the effectiveness of RNR approaches to supervising offenders related to positive outcomes (Bonta et al., 2011; Bourgon et al., 2012; Labrecque, Schweitzer, & Smith, 2013a, Latessa et al., 2012; Robinson et al., 2012; Smith et al., 2012; Taxman et al., 2006; Trotter, 1996; 2006). To the authors' knowledge, it is the first study to explore the influence of a community supervision model (i.e., EPICS) on the intermediate measure of antisocial attitude (as evidenced by the scores on the CSS-M assessment). The findings of the study suggest that those offenders that are supervised by EPICS-trained officers were more likely to have positive (reduced) scores on the two CSS-M domains of Identification with Criminal Others (ICO) and Tolerance for Law Violators (TLV) at post-test compared to offenders supervised by untrained officers. Although the total CSS-M score and the domain of Attitudes towards the Law, Courts, and Police (LCP) were not found to be statistically associated, both were in the hypothesized direction. This supports the EPICS model as effective as a means to reduce the antisocial thinking patterns of offenders supervised by officers trained in the model.

The results from this study are certainly encouraging. However, there are a few limitations that should be understood before proceeding with any potential policy changes.

TABLE 4.
Chi-Square Analysis of Prevalence of Positive or Negative Changes to CSS-M Scores by Group Type

Change in Score	Trained		Untrained		χ^2	<i>p</i>
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%		
LCP					0.05	.826
Positive	25	43.1	23	41.1		
Negative	33	56.9	33	58.9		
TLV					2.92	.087
Positive	31	53.4	21	37.5		
Negative	27	46.6	35	62.5		
ICO					3.68	.055
Positive	30	51.7	19	33.9		
Negative	28	48.3	37	66.1		
Total Score					0.46	.498
Positive	29	50.0	24	43.6		
Negative	29	50.0	31	56.4		

Note. Positive = improved score (lower score at post-test than at pre-test). Negative = same or worse score (same or higher score at post-test than at pre-test).

First, the probation and parole officers in this study were able to select the offenders included in this investigation. Although the offenders in treatment and control groups were similar in the characteristics examined, there is the potential that some level of unmeasured bias could have influenced their selection. Second, a strict criterion for inclusion was enforced. Only offenders that were moderate- or high-risk for recidivism, ages 14-65, fluent in English, not sentenced for a sex offense, and without a diagnosis of a severe mental illness were included in the study. Such a design is able to advance knowledge for the type of offenders included in the study, but the results may not necessarily translate to those groups not included in the study. Third, the measurement of antisocial attitude and values through the use of the CSS-M relies solely upon offender self-report, and there is reason to speculate that some offenders may not be truthful in reporting their level of procriminal thinking. However, research has continuously found that antisocial attitude assessments (including the CSS-M) possess adequate psychometric properties and the constructs of antisocial attitudes can be reliably measured (Andrews & Bonta, 2010). Regardless of the potential limitations of self-report measures, they remain the method of choice for assessing offender antisocial attitudes. Further, the use of the CSS-M is supported by the extant research and easily replicable for future study. Finally, although there was an attempt to obtain pre- and post-test information for all of the study participants, there are approximately half as many post-tests ($n = 121$) as there are pre-tests ($n = 238$). The attrition of the offenders submitting post-test information limits the value of the results drawn from the change in score analyses, as it is unknown if the results would have been the same if all of the offenders had completed the post-testing.

Future investigations of offender change could be more precise in examining the differences in score in alternative ways, such as the raw difference in score from pre-test to post-test, the percentage change in score from pre-test to post-test, or the use of more advanced change measures such as the Reliable Change Index (for more information see Jacobson, Follette, & Revenstorf, 1984).

Conclusion

There is little doubt that the recent initiatives to apply the principles of effective intervention in probation and parole settings (i.e., STICS, EPICS, STARR) will play an important

role in the future of community corrections. Prior research has found that these models are responsible for increasing officer use of core correctional skills (Bourgon et al., 2010; Bourgon & Gutierrez, 2012; Bonta et al., 2011; Labrecque et al., 2013b; Robinson et al., 2012; Smith et al., 2012; Trotter, 1996; Trotter & Evans, 2012), improving the relationship between officer and offender (Labrecque et al., 2013a), and, most important, reducing recidivism (Bonta et al., 2011; Latessa et al., 2012; Lowenkamp, Holsinger, Robinson, & Alexander, in press; Robinson et al., 2012; Taxman et al., 2006), especially when officers are also trained in motivational interviewing (Lowenkamp et al., in press). The current study adds to this research base by suggesting that these models may also be responsible for reducing offender antisocial attitudes. This is an important contribution and adds to the mounting support that community-based RNR models "work" (MacKenzie, 2006).

References

- Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (2010). *The psychology of criminal conduct* (5th ed.). Newark, NJ: LexisNexis.
- Andrews, D. A., & Wormith, J. S. (1984). *Criminal sentiments and criminal behaviour*. Programs Branch User Report. Ottawa: Solicitor General Canada.
- Barriga, A. Q., & Gibbs, J. C. (1996). Measuring cognitive distortion in antisocial youth: Development and preliminary validation of the "How I Think" questionnaire. *Aggressive Behavior*, 22(5), 333-343.
- Barriga, A. Q., Hawkins, M. A., & Camelia, C. R. T. (2008). Specificity of cognitive distortions to antisocial behaviors. *Criminal Behavior and Mental Health*, 18, 104-116.
- Barriga, A. Q., Landau, J., Stinson, B. L., Liao, A. K., & Gibbs, J. C. (2000). Cognitive distortion and problem behaviors in adolescents. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 27(1), 36-56.
- Barriga, A. Q., Morrison, E. M., Liao, A. K., & Gibbs, J. C. (2001). Moral cognition: Explaining the gender difference in antisocial behavior. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 47(4), 532-562.
- Bonta, J., Bourgon, G., Rugge, T., Scott, T., Yessine, A. K., Gutierrez, L., & Li, J. (2011). An experimental demonstration of training probation officers in evidence-based community supervision. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 38(11), 1127-1148.
- Bonta, J., Rugge, T., Scott, T., Bourgon, G., & Yessine, A. K. (2008). Exploring the black box of community supervision. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 47(3), 248-270.
- Bourgon, G., & Gutierrez, L. (2012). The general responsiveness principle in community supervision: The importance of probation officers using cognitive intervention techniques and its influence on recidivism. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 35(2), 149-166.
- Bourgon, G., Gutierrez, L., & Ashton, J. (2012). The evolution of community supervision practice: The transformation from case manager to change agent. *Federal Probation*, 76(2), 27-35.
- Dodge, K. A. (1993). Social-cognitive mechanisms in the development of conduct disorder and depression. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 44, 559-584.
- Egan, V., McMurrin, M., Richardson, C., & Blair, M. (2000). Criminal cognitions and personality: What does the PICTS really measure? *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health*, 10(3), 170-184.
- Gendreau, P. (1996). The principles of effective intervention with offenders. In A. Harland (Ed.), *Choosing correctional options that work: Defining the demand and evaluating the supply*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gendreau, P., Goggin, C. E., Chanteloupe, F., & Andrews, D. A. (1992). *The development of clinical and policy guidelines for prediction of criminal behavior in criminal justice settings* (Programs Branch User Report). Ottawa: Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada.
- Gendreau, P., Little, T., & Goggin, C. (1996). A meta-analysis of the predictors of adult offender recidivism: What works. *Criminology*, 34(4), 575-608.
- Gibbs, J. C. (1993). Moral-cognitive interventions. In A. P. Goldstein & C. R. Huff (Eds.), *The gang intervention handbook* (pp. 159-185). Champaign, IL: Research Press.
- Gibbs, J. C., Potter, G., & Goldstein, A. P. (1995). *The EQUIP program: Teaching youth to think and act responsibly through a peer-helping approach*. Champaign, IL: Research Press.
- Hubbard, D. J., & Pratt, T. C. (2002). A meta-analysis of the predictors of delinquency among girls. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 34(3), 1-13.
- Jacobson, N. S., Follette, W. C., & Revenstorf, D. (1984). Psychotherapy outcome research: Methods for reporting and evaluating clinical significance. *Behavior Therapy*, 15, 336-352.
- Labrecque, R. M., Schweitzer, M., & Smith, P. (2013a). Exploring the perceptions of the offender-officer relationship in a community supervision setting. *Journal of International Criminal Justice Research*, 1. Retrieved from <http://www.aabri.com/manuscripts/121424.pdf>

- Labrecque, R. M., Schweitzer, M., & Smith, P. (2013b). Probation and parole officer adherence to the core correctional practices: An evaluation of 755 offender-officer interactions. *Advancing Practices*, 3, 20-23.
- Latessa, E. J., Smith, P., Schweitzer, M., & Labrecque, R. M. (2012). *Evaluation of the Effective Practices in Community Supervision Model (EPICS) in Ohio*. Cincinnati, OH: University of Cincinnati.
- Leschied, A., Chiodo, D., Nowicki, E., & Rodger, S. (2008). Childhood predictors of adult criminality: A meta-analysis drawn from the prospective longitudinal literature. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 50(4), 435-467.
- Liau, A. K., Barriga, A. Q., & Gibbs, J. C. (1998). Relations between self-serving cognitive distortions and overt vs. covert antisocial behavior in adolescents. *Aggressive Behavior*, 24, 335-346.
- Lowenkamp, C. T., Holsinger, A. M., Robinson, C. R., & Alexander, M. (in press). Diminishing or durable treatment effects of STARR? A research note on 24-month re-arrest rates. Forthcoming in *Journal of Crime and Justice*.
- MacKenzie, D. L. (2006). *What works in corrections: Reducing the criminal activities of offenders and delinquents*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- McGuire, J. (2013). 'What works' to reduce re-offending: 18 years on. In L. A. Craig, L. Dixon, & T. A. Gannon (Eds.), *What works in offender rehabilitation: An evidence-based approach to assessment and treatment* (pp. 20-49). Chichester, West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Palmer, E. J. (2007). Criminal thinking. In D. Carson, B. Milne, F. Pakes, K. Shalev, & A. Shawyer (Eds.), *Applying psychology to criminal justice* (pp.147-165). Chichester, UK: Wiley.
- Petersilia, J. (1998). A decade of experimenting with intermediate sanctions: What have we learned? *Federal Probation*, 58(1), 72-78.
- Petersilia, J., & Turner, S. (1993). Intensive probation and parole. In M. Tonry (Ed.), *Crime and justice: A review of research* (Vol. 17, pp. 281-335). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Robinson, C. R., Lowenkamp, C. T., Holsinger, A. M., VanBenschoten, S. W., Alexander, M., & Oleson, J. C. (2012). A random study of Staff Training Aimed at Reducing Rearrest (STARR): Using core correctional practices in probation interactions. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 35(2), 167-188.
- Samenow, S. E. (1984). *Inside the criminal mind*. New York: Random House.
- Sherman, L. W., Gottfredson, D., MacKenzie, D. L., Eck, J., Reuter, P., & Bushway, S. (1997). *Preventing crime: What works, what doesn't, what's promising*. (Report to the U.S. Congress). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Shields, I., & Simourd, D. J. (1991). Predicting predatory behavior in a population of young offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 18(2), 180-194.
- Simourd, D. (1997). The Criminal Sentiments Scale-Modified and Pride in Delinquency scale: Psychometric properties and construct validity of two measures of criminal attitudes. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 40(1), 52-70.
- Simourd, D. J., & Olver, M. (2002). The future of criminal attitude research and practice. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 29(4), 427-446.
- Simourd, D. J., & Van De Ven, J. (1999). Assessment of criminal attitudes: Criterion-related validity of the Criminal Sentiments Scale-Modified and Pride in Delinquency scale. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 26(1), 90-106.
- Simourd, L., & Andrews, D. A. (1994). Correlates of delinquency: A look at gender differences. *Forum on Corrections Research*, 6(1), 26-31.
- Smith, P., Schweitzer, M., Labrecque, R. M., & Latessa, E. J. (2012). Improving probation officers' supervision skills: An evaluation of the EPICS model. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 35(2), 189-199.
- Solomon, A. L. (2006, Spring). Does parole supervision work? Research findings and policy opportunities. *Perspectives*, 26-37.
- Solomon, A. L., Kachnowski, V., Bhati, A. (2005). *Does parole work? Analyzing the impact of postprison supervision on rearrest outcomes*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Justice Policy Center.
- Sykes, G. M., & Matza, D. (1957). Techniques of neutralization: A theory of delinquency. *American Sociological Review*, 22, 664-670.
- Taxman, F. S., Yancey, C., & Bilanin, J. (2006). *Proactive community supervision in Maryland: Changing offender outcomes*. College Park: University of Maryland, Bureau of Government Research.
- Trotter, C. (1996). The impact of different supervision practices in community corrections: Cause for optimism. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 29(1), 1-18.
- Trotter, C. (2006). *Working with involuntary clients: A guide to practice* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Trotter, C., & Evans, P. (2012). An analysis of supervision skills in youth probation. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 45(2), 255-273.
- Wallinius, M., Johansson, P., Larden, M., & Dernevik, M. (2011). Self-serving cognitive distortions and antisocial behavior among adults and adolescents. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 38(3), 286-301.
- Witte, T. D., Di Placido, C., Gu, D., & Wong, S. C. (2006). An investigation of the validity and reliability of the Criminal Sentiments Scale in a sample of treated sex offenders. *Sexual Abuse*, 18(3), 249-258.
- Yochelson, S., & Samenow, S. E. (1976). *The criminal personality: A profile for change* (vol. 1). New York: Jason Aronson.

Use of Engagement Skills in Community Corrections for High-Risk Offenders

Natalie Pearl

Director of Research, San Diego County Probation

Karyn Milligan

Community Corrections Partnership Analyst

Michael Hall

Probation Supervisor, San Diego County Probation Department

Mack Jenkins

Chief Probation Officer, San Diego County Probation Department

IN THE LAST two years, California has seen the most fundamental change in public safety in recent history with passage of the Public Safety Realignment-Assembly Bill (AB) 109. The realignment shifted post-custody supervision of many offenders sentenced to prison from the statewide Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation parole division to county probation departments. Additionally, some offenders who previously would have served a custodial sentence in state prison now serve that time in local jail custody. Of those offenders now serving their custodial time locally, some receive a “split sentence” and leave jail under the supervision of officers employed by probation departments. Counties throughout the state vary widely, ranging from 2 percent to 94 percent, in their use of this split sentencing practice. The County of San Diego is at the state average, with approximately 24 percent of local prison sentences split between local incarceration and mandatory community supervision by probation officers.

Throughout California, probation departments have responded to the influx of over 36,000 Post Release Community Supervision (PRCS) offenders placed under their jurisdiction as a result of the legislation by creating new divisions of armed officers and preparing them to supervise a population of offenders that pose a higher risk than those traditionally

seen on probation caseloads. In San Diego County, for example, 73 percent of PRCS offenders and 60 percent of those under mandatory supervision were assessed at high risk to reoffend. This compares with 28 percent of those under traditional probation supervision.

San Diego is the second largest county in the state, with over 3 million residents and 14,000 adult and 4,500 juvenile offenders under supervision. The county anticipated an increase of approximately 2,000 PRCS adult offenders as a result of realignment, a 14 percent relative increase in adults under supervision. To supervise this new population, an additional 108 positions were required—77 of them sworn officers. Because most of the case-carrying officers in the newly formed Post Release Offender (PRO) Division are required to be armed, nearly 11 percent of the officers transferred from existing armed assignments, including High Risk Probation Supervision and Gang Suppression. Many of the rest were promoted from institutional assignments, making the PRO Division their first experience as a case-carrying probation officer.

Due to the large geographic area encompassed by the county, PRO Division units are organized regionally and include specialized caseloads to more closely supervise sex offenders and those offenders released from local custody on split sentences (mandatory

supervision offenders or MSOs). As of March 2013, the division actively supervised more than 2,000 offenders, including 1,798 PRCS offenders released from state prison and 225 MSOs released from local custody. Combined, 70 percent of offenders under supervision in the PRO Division pose a high risk to reoffend, 14 percent pose a medium risk, and the remaining 16 percent scored as low risk on the COMPAS risk assessment tool. In terms of the committing offense, 34 percent have committed a property offense, 40 percent a drug- or alcohol-related crime, 12 percent a crime against a person, 6 percent a weapons-related offense, and the remaining 8 percent are classified in the “other” category. A typical PRCS offender can be categorized as White (34 percent), between 25-34 years of age (33 percent), with a drug or alcohol (40 percent) or property (34 percent) committing offense type.

PRO Division caseload ratios are determined by offender type and risk level. Those released from state prison assessed as high risk are supervised on caseloads of 40:1; medium and low risk are supervised on caseloads of 65:1. Those who have received a split sentence and are in the community are supervised at 25:1. The supervision ratios are outlined in the county’s mandated realignment plan that was submitted to the state. The element of the plan that is most relevant to the supervision of

offenders states that Post Release Community Offenders will be supervised using supervision and community-based intervention services that adhere to Evidence-Based principles (EBP). Specifically, the plan includes references to the balanced approach, ensuring that the role of the PRO Division officer is that of a case manager and incorporates elements designed to hold offenders accountable and to reduce recidivism through proven engagement techniques, motivational interviewing, and cognitive behavioral interventions. Other elements of the supervision plan include adherence to the risk principle, more intensive supervision of higher-risk offenders, creation of case plans that contain specific referrals to community-based treatment and intervention services, and employment of swift and sure sanctions for noncompliant behavior as well as incentives for compliant behavior.

The commitment outlined in the realignment plan has been reinforced with a grant from the Office of Justice Programs (OJP) in the Smart Probation category. This grant has funded the assignment of a supervising probation officer knowledgeable about EBPs to the PRO Division. This officer's sole purpose is supporting the implementation and training of the practice model outlined above with the case-carrying officers supervising high-risk offenders. The grant has also funded a six-month probation leadership academy based on the idea that EBP cannot be "added on" to probation supervision as usual but must be the result of change that begins with leading by example. The change process requires strong leadership based on both substantive knowledge and the intangible qualities that create followership. The department's experience with change over the past three years has brought home the value of specific leadership training. The department is collaborating with the Center for Criminality and Addiction Research, Training & Application (CCARTA) at the University of California San Diego and with Dr. Christopher Lowenkamp to provide this training. The leadership academy topics relate directly to departmental evidence-based strategies, including quality assurance of Integrated Behavioral Intervention Strategies (IBIS) and case management skills. In addition to the leadership academy for the directors and supervisors, all PRO Division staff have been or will be trained in IBIS.

As important as if not more important than what the officer does is how the officer does it—in other words, how the officer

engages with the offender. According to Chief Probation Officer Mack Jenkins, to achieve our mission and produce the best outcomes, we must become law enforcement behaviorists; focusing not only on the crime a person has committed or the terms he or she is ordered to follow, but rather on the most effective ways to change the offender's behavior.

The engagement model in San Diego is based on the integration of two research-based techniques: motivational interviewing and brief cognitive behavioral interventions. Integrated Behavioral Intervention Strategies (IBIS) training brings motivational interviewing and cognitive behavioral skills to San Diego County probation officers as tools that allow for greater engagement with the probationer, leading to reduced recidivism. According to this training design, senior probation officers from each adult and juvenile service, as well as shift leaders from correctional institutions, are trained as coaches and mentors and then participate again with their mentees to support in-class and in vivo opportunities to practice the skills. Seniors and supervisors then provide the support for implementing the skills during interactions with offenders. The long-term support mechanisms include abbreviated training refreshers at unit meetings and regular feedback of live and recorded interactions between officers and offenders. These efforts are provided by the EBP Support Team, the Smart Probation supervisor, and coaches and mentors assigned to the operational units.

Research Intent

With a commitment to supervise offenders in the PRO division using evidence-based practices, the department has invested in providing IBIS training and practice opportunities to line staff in addition to training senior officers to act as coaches and mentors. However, the question remains how well the IBIS model is being implemented in the PRO Division. Specifically, we wanted to know the level of integration that can be expected within a division with responsibility to maintain public safety by supervising high-risk offenders who, in the past, would have been under parole supervision or in state prison. This research is specifically designed to help community corrections agencies implement engagement-focused supervision in all types of supervision units by adapting training, coaching, and mentoring as needed to meet the needs of officers.

Research Methods and Questions

This research relied on the use of informal focus groups to answer the research questions. Although this method does not necessarily allow findings to be generalized to all community corrections officers, all high-risk officers, or even all officers in San Diego County, the benefit of interviewing those most affected by the change to the engagement model far outweighs the methodological limitations.

Four sixty-minute focus groups were held in March 2013 in geographically diverse locations in San Diego County. Three of the four focus groups were held with a mix of deputy, senior, and supervising probation officers who are responsible for the community corrections supervision of realigned populations as part of the Post Release Offender (PRO) Division. The fourth focus group included a senior officer and deputy probation officers who are responsible for assessing state prison inmates immediately upon their arrival in the county. This program, the Community Transition Center, also drug-tests returning offenders, provides referrals to appropriate community-based services (including detoxification, inpatient drug treatment, outpatient drug treatment, and mental health services) and, if needed, provides for up to seven days of transitional housing. The last group was a debrief session with the supervising officers from throughout the division. The debrief material was used to inform the discussion of the findings and the creation of the recommendations.

The focus groups were facilitated by probation staff at the director level, accompanied and assisted by either a sworn or support staff at the supervisor level. The focus group proceedings were recorded using a process note procedure. The notes were analyzed for themes; the findings, which are organized by theme, are presented below. The discussion and conclusion are the result of consultation among the authors. Although the research design called for a discussion of the themes with the division supervisors and director, this did not happen due to scheduling difficulties.

In all, 27 deputy probation officers, 5 senior probation officers, and 5 supervising probation officers were included in the four focus groups and the debrief session. As stated above, many of the more seasoned officers (approximately 11 percent) had been transferred from armed positions, including the gang suppression unit and high-risk adult probation supervision. For 8 percent of officers, the PRO Division was the first

assignment they held with the department, while 31 percent of officers had primarily institutional experience, including 1 of the supervising officers. This bears repeating, as it speaks to the limited exposure of these officers to evidence-based and balanced-approach casework in their past assignments.

Approximately 42 percent of the DPOs had been through classroom IBIS training. Although not all of the officers who participated in the focus groups had attended the formal training, they were asked to participate based on the fact that the IBIS information is seeping into the workplace in other ways than the in-class training. For example, all work sites have IBIS posters that remind staff of the key elements of the model, and supervisors are encouraged to discuss the model components at unit meetings.

Informed Consent: Officers were invited to attend the focus group introductory meetings by a supervising probation officer associated with the division. Once at the meeting, officers were provided with a full description of the purposes of the research, an overview of the methods, and the questions that would be asked. All officers were assured that their answers would only be reported in the aggregate and that there were no ramifications to not participating in the focus groups. Each officer was asked if he or she would like to participate and each officer verbally acknowledged having understood the information and assented to continue with the research.

Research Questions: The following questions were asked in the focus groups:

1. How did the IBIS training impact you as an officer?
2. How are you using the IBIS skills during office visits? and
3. How are you using IBIS skills during field visits?

The questions were asked several times during the discussion to ensure that each officer had a chance to express his or her opinions. Responses were encouraged from officers who tended not to participate proactively in the conversation, although no officers were required to respond and not all officers responded to all of the questions.

Findings

How Did the Training Impact You?

When asked how the training impacted them, many of the officers responded by offering feedback on the training itself. The next two paragraphs summarize that feedback. Many

officers felt that the training, which lasts three days, was too long. For those who participated in three days as a coach and then an additional three days as a mentor with their mentees, the feeling was doubled. Many respondents stated that there was too much theoretical and background information and they would have preferred more time spent on hands-on practice of the skills. Officers reported that while they were able to practice the skills in the classroom, the practice did not translate well to their work environments. This was particularly true of officers assigned to work in an institution at the time they participated in the trainings.

It Wasn't the Right Time

The timing of the training (which included preparation for the training and where the officer was assigned at the time of the training) was an important theme emerging from this question. Participation in the training immediately upon being hired was disconcerting to some new officers who had not yet mastered the basics of the job yet were asked to spend three days in training for a skill that to them seemed out of context. Another issue was participating in IBIS training while assigned to work in an institution. Officers in this situation reported that the application of the skills in the institutions seemed limited. Further, they reported that it was unrealistic for them to be trained in these skills in an environment in which there was little expectation that they could be used, and then to be expected to have retained the information and skills perhaps 18 months later when promoted or transferred to a case-carrying position.

We Already Do That!

Many officers expressed statements such as: "We already do that" or "They just gave a new name to skill we already had." Some officers linked the training to skills or training they had acquired in previous employment, including as a social worker, in the military, or as a treatment provider. For many more, however, the "we already do that" was more of a linking to the skills that they already use as a probation officer.

Because this understanding was so prevalent, we provide some of the most common examples. One of these is effective use of approval, one of the core correctional practices that involves identifying the inappropriate behavior and telling the probationer that the officer disapproves of the action; asking the probationer to identify the short-term

consequences of the behavior; asking the probationer to identify long-term consequences of the action; asking the probationer to identify and discuss the prosocial alternatives to the unacceptable behavior; and contracting with the probationer to use prosocial alternatives in the future. Effective use of approval was often characterized by the officers as positive reinforcement. Statements such as, "I always tell the offenders when they are doing good job" were used to show that effective use of approval was a skill already widely in use.

In the same vein, most officers felt that they had always used effective use of disapproval. Statements like, "I don't hesitate to tell offenders when they have done something wrong" and "Arrest is the ultimate use of disapproval" show how they overlaid the training onto existing activities. Finally, most of the officers who responded this way also felt they already had role clarification as a skill in their tool box. They thought of role clarification as going over terms and conditions of supervision and ensuring that offenders knew the rights and responsibilities of the officers. Some officers characterized this as using the IBIS skills informally rather formally. Many officers used phrases such as, "I don't use them by name," "I do them verbally rather than using the worksheets," and "I will use some of them but the ones that require a formal procedure are not realistic" to show that they use IBIS skills in an informal versus formal way.

On the other hand, some officers reported that a focus on thinking errors using the formal IBIS tools during interactions was important and useful. One officer specifically mentioned that using the RACE skills helped to focus the offender and the interaction in a positive way. The RACE skills are 1) Recognizing high-risk influences that tempt the offender, 2) Avoiding high-risk influences whenever possible, 3) Coping with high-risk influences responsibly, and 4) Evaluating progress after each encounter in which Recognizing, Avoiding, and Coping were used.

A related theme was that the IBIS skills improved their communication in general and the motivational interviewing skills helped them specifically to gather information in a more organized fashion. Comments grouped into this theme were generally prefaced with a statement that the respondent was an experienced interviewer but that the skills, when used in interviewing, produced more information—and that information came from a different point of view. The most positive statement in this area came from

an officer who noted that the information collected through the interview process was now not so cut and dried; rather, he could see the relationship of the information to the lives that had been affected by the offender, including the life of the offender himself. This was seen as a positive reason for the training to be supported by the department. Officers specifically mentioned that the IBIS skills help the officer understand more about the offender's needs and bring a new view of speaking to youth in institutions.

Some officers were very clear about the benefits of using the skills. For these officers, having the tools to go beyond what offenders reported as their actions and decisions to the underlying thinking errors was seen as very helpful. The ability to point out to an offender where and when thinking errors were occurring was seen as positive. At least two of the officers specifically pointed out that the behavioral analysis chart helped both officers and offenders see what led to the current situation. Officers also reported that this tool made it easier for offenders to see the link between choices and behavior. For another officer, using the skills helped him focus on one or two of the most important items per visit.

The use of skills, however, was at times seen as a double-edged sword. While some officers acknowledged that the skills worked; others saw this as a problem. For example, an officer specifically identified reflections as a good way to get offenders to open up and provide information, but at the same time the officer felt caught in a bind of having to then "cut off" the offender from "spending 10 minutes telling the officer about his mother."

Great Training But...

Many of the officers observed that the IBIS skills were a positive set of skills to use with offenders but that the officer was not the right one to use them. Some officers felt that these skills were best left to treatment providers, residential substance abuse treatment, or juvenile officers. Others identified systemic barriers to implementing the skills, including high case-loads and the related lack of time; this led to many comments that the skills were too time consuming. More than one officer mentioned that, despite directions to the contrary, an offender had admitted to a new crime while undergoing the behavioral analysis. This was a fairly widespread concern and one that was cited as a reason why case-carrying officers should not utilize these skills.

One officer saw the value in the skills but felt that the results would not be apparent in the time frame of the officer's responsibility, and therefore it was better left to someone who would have a longer-term relationship with the offender. Another stated that it was difficult to hold an offender accountable while at the same time trying to motivate the offender to change. Finally, while one of the officers who participated in the focus group stated that she was open to the use of the skills, she felt that many other officers were closed-minded and that this was a barrier to implementation.

Offender's Point of View and Motivation Level

Some of the officers' comments related predominantly to how they believed these skills were impacting the offender. For example, one comment reflected a commonly held belief was that while the skills are valuable for officers, they will only affect those offenders who choose to be affected by them. Related comments came from officers who felt that only those offenders who were tired of going to jail would be open to change. Also, an officer mentioned the perception that an offender's motivation to change was the highest immediately after being released from custody and then declined over time. An officer expressed it this way: "Some will get it, no surprise that most won't get it—many of them (offenders) stopped developing at 12 (years old)." Other officers acknowledged that the offender was motivated to change by what happened in the office visit, but felt the motivation did not persist once the offender left the office; the following comment represents this viewpoint: "the department's changes have good intentions but the outcomes will not change." Mental illness in offenders was also seen as a barrier to engagement.

One officer suspected that offenders will have increased respect for officers who consistently communicate using the IBIS methods. According to another officer, one of her offenders noticed that the IBIS techniques being used were similar to those the offender experienced in treatment and commented that this is a change for offenders, as they, "are not used to being asked to think, they are used to being told what to do."

Using IBIS Skills in the Field

All of the findings up to this point were in response to the first two research questions: "How did the training impact you?" and "How are you using the IBIS skills during office

visits?" This last section, however, examines responses to the third research question: "How are you using the IBIS skills during home visits?" The responses to this question were very different from the answers to the first two, because they were not directly about the IBIS skills. Instead, they were about the difficulty that officers experienced in using engagement skills because of the perceived conflict of such skills with officer safety. Some officers felt that the skills undermined their authority and their role, especially during home visits.

All of the officers who conduct field visits in offenders' homes focused on the need for constant awareness of their surroundings and of those in the home. Their standard operating procedure for home visits is to handcuff the offender in the home until the home is "cleared." Comments such as these epitomize officer responses to this question: "IBIS does not work with an offender in handcuffs" and "Anytime we show up at an offender's home uninvited, sometimes with up to ten personnel, the tension level goes up, it is difficult to put IBIS skills into those situations."

Some further probing, elicited some positives. Officers did verbalize that incorporating some of the IBIS skills into the home visit could potentially turn a negative experience into a more positive one. The IBIS skills were also seen as a way to increase family buy-in, which officers saw as important. In addition, officers saw use of the IBIS skills as a way to reinforce the idea of a respectful interchange and help them to maintain their professional demeanor during the home visit. Interestingly, one group of officers expressed that often the most open period of a home visit was once an offender was placed under arrest and was in the back of the probation vehicle being transported to jail. There was consensus that this period of time could be used for engagement and that IBIS skills, at least verbal ones, could be used during this time.

Discussion and Recommendations

Based on the findings outlined above, we have developed the following recommendations that we believe will help our department and others to bridge the gap between training and implementation of an engagement model. Each recommendation will be followed by a discussion of how it was arrived at.

In-Office Support

The training model that has been implemented requires officers to audiotape themselves using the skills in the office. Coaches review the audiotapes and provide feedback. While we believe that the tapes are a useful training tool, the responses in the focus groups suggest that they are not enough. Therefore our first recommendation is to provide additional in-office support for officers in the first four weeks following training. The support will include ensuring that all officers who are trained meet with their in-office coach within the first week after the training. This engagement will ensure that the officer has a chance to debrief the training and get answers to any questions that were not answered in the training.

Second, based on feedback and observation, we recommend a focus on ensuring that written materials are available in each office. Coaches will be responsible for verifying that staff have their training manual at their desk and will also provide a newly developed desk reference developed by our EBP operational support team. These materials provide a “quick start” guide to the steps of the cognitive behavioral and motivational interviewing skills, as well as information about stages of change. In addition, the coach will set up direct observation time with each staff to offer the practical advice on when and how the skills can be incorporated into office visits.

Because supervising officers are a crucial part of the sustained use of IBIS, the last component of ongoing IBIS support will be training and support for supervisors. While most supervisors have completed two 8-hour IBIS overview classes, the EBP operational support team will ensure supervisors’ continued engagement through regular in-service training of IBIS skills in unit meetings and feedback on observed and recorded officer and offender interactions.

Be the Change We Want to See

This recommendation is fundamentally a re-imagining of the role of the community corrections officers from a traditional model of compliance monitoring and “waiting to fail” the offender to one of a proactive change manager, a “behaviorist.” This recommendation requires change and support at the top

and through all of the ranks. More specifically, it requires that the language of change be incorporated into all communication, from training to the writing of policy and procedure to informal communication in meetings, memos, and emails. This recommendation also incorporates the idea of a formal communication from the agency head to all officers upon promotion to supervisor. The communication could combine a message of congratulations with clear and specific information about the role of a supervisor in an agency that has made a commitment to the engagement model.

This does not require a complete U-turn from our original direction, but rather a conscious building on what we have while incorporating change. Coaches and the support team can begin to use the idea that officers have parts of the skills already integrated into their tool kit to support the use of the full IBIS skills. For example, many officers cited examples of positive affirmations when describing their effective use of approval. While the elements of positive affirmation are inherent in the skill, there is more to this skill than that. Coaches need to communicate how to build upon the skills that officers are already using and are comfortable with.

Understanding the perspective of the staff will allow coaches to start where the officer is and acknowledge that the first elements of the skill are already in use. Then building on that, coaches may be more successful in showing the officer how to utilize all the steps of the skill.

After the Flash

Building on findings above, including the findings that 1) offenders are often more motivated immediately upon release, 2) an arrest or flash incarceration can be an effective sanction (use of disapproval), and 3) officers often feel unsure of when to use the IBIS skills, we recommend more formal guidelines for the use of IBIS skills. While this may prove to be a short-lived necessity, we feel that it is important to 1) create an environment where officers understand the value of the skills and when they have the most impact and 2) ensure that new officers who come into case-carrying assignments will be trained in the use of the IBIS skills in a consistent way.

The first place that IBIS skills should be used is during the initial appointments between the offender and the officer. These meetings are a perfect setting for the use of role clarification and effective use of approval. As the appointments move into case planning, motivational interviewing skills and acknowledgement of stages of change are vital to move these appointments from compliance visits to opportunities for engagement.

The second place that all officers should be using IBIS skills is during the mandatory office appointment that offenders must attend after a flash incarceration. Cognitive behavioral skills such as effective use of disapproval and role clarification can reinforce the use of a flash incarceration as the response to a non-compliant event.

Managing Motivation

One of the tenets of offender change is that motivation is a variable state and that offenders, like the rest of us, are always somewhere on the continuum of motivation. The finding that officers still at times see motivation as a static factor—one that is either present or absent—suggests a need to build into the coach-officer interaction a specific conversation about an offender’s stage of change. To facilitate this, the “quick start” guides mentioned above will incorporate specific information about stages of change adapted from the National Institute of Corrections materials.

Once the stage of change is identified, the coach can then offer input about which of the tools from the IBIS tool kit may be appropriate. This will encourage officers to see that offenders at all stages of change and levels of motivation can be helped by these tools.

Conclusion

This qualitative look at the implementation of IBIS was very helpful to our Evidence Based Practices Operational Support team as well as the supervising officer assigned to assist our newest division to incorporate the use of the IBIS skills into their everyday work. The findings and recommendations will guide us as we move to full implementation of the engagement model. Our hope is that they will also be useful to jurisdictions across the country and beyond who are facing similar road bumps on their journey.

Exit Status of Probationers and Prison-Bound Offenders in an Electronic Monitoring Home Detention Program: A Comparative Study

Sudipto Roy

Indiana State University

A VARIETY OF “intermediate sanctions” is used for accused and convicted offenders in the United States. “Intermediate sanctions” comprise a continuum of punishments between traditional/regular probation and imprisonment. Electronically-monitored home detention (EMHD) is one of those intermediate sanctions. “Electronic monitoring, which is used to enforce the conditions of release for criminal offenders, strengthens the ability of corrections officials and law enforcement authorities to supervise offenders in the community by keeping them under closer surveillance than they otherwise could” (Barry, 2009, p. 1). In the United States, the first EMHD program for adult offenders was established by the Palm Beach County, Florida, Sheriff’s Department as an in-house arrest work-release program in 1984 (Brown & Roy, 1995). EMHD programs are used to monitor varied types of defendants and offenders “who may be under the supervision of pretrial release, prison or jail release programs, probation, or parole” (Barry, 2009, p. 2). In several jurisdictions, convicted offenders are also placed in these programs in lieu of a jail sentence. As for offense types, these programs across the United States include varied types of defendants and offenders, e.g., those charged with as well as convicted for personal offenses, property offenses, and also drunk driving (Di Tella & Schargrodsky, 2009). These are non-residential programs. Hence, participants in these programs are allowed to stay at their own residences, continue their employment and/or education, avail themselves of treatment/counseling, and maintain their family ties (Ball, Huff, & Lilly, 1988). In the United States, numerous

research findings on the EMHD programs have been reported since the late 1980s. Individually, some of the studies “provide snapshots of the field implementation of electronic monitoring programs, delivered by a specific organization in a particular setting for a particular group of offenders” (Baumer, Maxfield, & Mendelsohn, 1993, p. 124). Also, some previous researchers included small samples of offenders (Lilly, Ball, & Wright, 1987; Charles, 1989). The majority of previous researchers focused on individual program completion percentages, factors related to the participants’ failure in completing their programs, and to some extent on post-program recidivism among the participants who had successfully completed their programs. Also, some previous researchers reviewed electronic monitoring from a crime-control perspective (e.g., Barry, 2009). Only a few authors have focused on the specific types of offenders (e.g., convicted drunk drivers) placed on EMHD programs (Barton & Roy, 2008; Roy & Barton, 2006; Minnesota Department of Corrections, 2002; Jones & Lacey, 2000). However, the fact remains that no comparative study has been conducted when different types (e.g., probationers and prison-bound offenders) are sentenced to these programs. Given that context, the purpose of the present study is to focus on probationers and prison-bound offenders sentenced to an EMHD program in a Midwestern county. In this Midwestern county, two types of convicted offenders are sentenced to the EMHD program. First, convicted offenders are sentenced to this program as an additional condition to their probation sentences. Second, convicted offenders who are sentenced to at least two years of prison

are placed in this program to save taxpayers’ money. This study included these two types of convicted offenders who were placed in this EMHD program and completed or failed to complete their sentences from the beginning of 2007 through the end of 2010 (four-year time period). Specifically, the objective of this study was to expand on the literature by focusing on the “exit status” of the probationers and prison-bound offenders sentenced to the EMHD program during the four-year study period.

Previous Research

A review of previous research indicates that the majority of these programs administered in the U.S. involve non-violent offenders and those with non-violent offense records (Barton & Roy, 2008; Finn & Muirhead-Steves, 2002; Roy, 1999, 1997; Zhang, Polakow, & Nidorf, 1995; Brown, & Roy, 1995; Baumer, Maxfield, & Mendelsohn, 1993; Coopridner, 1992; Lilly, Ball, Curry, & Smith, 1992; Vaughn, 1991, 1987; Clarkson & Weakland, 1991; Kuplinski, 1990; Charles, 1989; Blomberg, Waldo, & Burcroff, 1987; Lilly, Ball, & Wright, 1987). Also, some programs supervise only those offenders who are sentenced to jail or prison for a given number of days (Roy, 1999, 1997; Lilly, Ball, & Wright, 1987). On the other hand, some programs exclude offenders who have pending charges or have records of absconding (Kuplinski, 1990). Furthermore, some programs exclude offenders who have multiple felony convictions, require in-patient substance abuse treatment, or are serving intermittent sentences (Brown & Roy, 1995).

Overall, previous researchers have focused on such aspects of these programs as viable

crime control strategies, the monitoring devices, cost analysis, percentages of offenders successfully exiting these programs, factors predicting offenders' successful exit, and post-program recidivism. Although the selection criteria vary from one jurisdiction to another, previous research reports indicate that between 57 percent and 92 percent of the offenders sentenced to these programs exited successfully.

- 97% in the West Palm Beach, Florida program (Lilly, Ball, Curry, & Smith, 1992)
- 94% in the Palm Beach County, Florida program (Friel & Vaughn, 1986)
- 93.5% across three programs in Indiana (Baumer, Maxfield, & Mendelsohn, 1993)
- 92% in the St. Paul, Minnesota program (Minnesota Dept. of Corrections, 2002)
- 91.4% in the Kenton County, Kentucky program (Lilly, Ball, & Wright, 1987)
- 91% in the Clackamas County, Oregon program (Rogers & Jolin, 1989)
- 90% across six programs in Virginia (Kuplinski, 1990)
- 90% in an evaluation of ten programs across the U.S. (Vaughn, 1987)
- 87% in the Harris County, Texas program (Enos, Black, Quinn, & Holman, 1992)
- 82% in the Oneida County, New York program (Brown & Roy, 1995)
- 81.6% in the Vigo County, Indiana program (Roy, 1994)
- 76% in the Vigo County, Indiana program (Barton and Roy, 2008)
- 75% in the Lake County, Indiana program (Roy, 1994)
- 75% in a national survey (Renzema & Skelton, 1990)
- 70% in the Palm Beach County, Florida Sheriff's Department In-house Arrest Program (Palm Beach County, Florida Sheriff's Department, 1987)
- 57% in the Dallas County, Texas program (Enos, Black, Quinn, & Holman, 1992).

Several previous researchers have focused on "exit status" of offenders placed in these programs. For instance, results from a national survey conducted by Renzema and Skelton (1990) revealed that an offender's age and sentence length were predictive of "exit status." They reported that offenders older than 35 years of age and offenders placed in these programs for more than six months were more likely to exit successfully than their younger cohorts and offenders placed in these programs for up to six months. Although the finding on an offender's age has been confirmed in the literature (Barton & Roy, 2008; Roy, 1999, 1997, 1994; Brown

& Roy, 1995; Lilly, Ball, Curry, & McMullen, 1993), the finding on an offender's sentence length from the national survey has not been supported by a number of previous studies (Roy, 1999, 1997; Brown & Roy, 1995). Several other factors have also been reported to be significantly related to "exit status," such as charge reduction (Barton & Roy, 2008), employment status (Roy, 1999; Lilly, Ball, Curry, & McMullen, 1993), gender, prior convictions (Roy, 1999; Lilly, Ball, Curry, & McMullen, 1993), income (Lilly, Ball, Curry, & McMullen, 1993), number of prior offenses, substance abuse history, prior institutional detention, and prior community corrections placement (Barton & Roy, 2008; Roy, 1997, 1994; Brown & Roy, 1995).

Furthermore, a cursory review of previous research indicates that offenders placed in these programs include varied types of offenders convicted for personal offenses, property offenses, traffic offenses (e.g., habitual traffic offenders, driving with suspended licenses, etc.), and also drunk driving. Barton and Roy (2008) reported that the following variables were significant predictors of successful exit from that program: age group, charge reduction, sentence length, prior drunk-driving record, prior drug/alcohol offense, and prior community corrections placement. They reported that (1) older-aged offenders (35 years and above), (2) offenders with no charge reduction, (3) offenders placed in the program for up to six months, (4) offenders with no prior drunk-driving record, (5) offenders with no prior drug/alcohol related offense, and (6) offenders with no prior community corrections placement had successfully exited the programs, compared to their cohorts.

In another study, Courtright, Berg, and Mutchnick (2000) investigated the factors significantly related to successful exit of the participants in the Western County, Pennsylvania program. The authors reported that employment (employed offenders had higher percentages of success than unemployed offenders), marital status (married offenders were more successful than unmarried offenders), and prior offense records (offenders with no prior offense records had higher percentages of success than those with prior records) were significantly related to successful exit during their one-year study period. The authors had conducted an earlier study in 1997 on the same program; however, in this 1997 study, they focused on cost analysis exclusively.

Lilly, Ball, Curry, and McMullen (1993) conducted a seven-year study on convicted offenders sentenced to the EMHD program administered by Pride Incorporated in Palm Beach County, Florida. The authors reported that 97 percent of the participants successfully completed their sentences. They also reported that gender (female offenders were more successful than male offenders), age (offenders more than 40 years old had more success than younger offenders), employment (employed offenders were more successful than their unemployed cohorts), and income (offenders who had more than \$10,000 annual income had more success than those with less than \$10,000 annual income) were significantly related to successful exit from that program.

Also, in 1986, Tuthill examined post-program recidivism among 60 convicted drunk drivers who successfully exited the EMHD program in Lynn County, Oregon, during a one-year study period. Tuthill reported that only 3 participants recidivated after successfully exiting from the EMHD program; no further analysis was reported by the author.

A review of previous research on offenders convicted for various types of offenses and placed in EMHD programs indicated that the following factors related to successful exit of the offenders from EMHD programs: gender (Lilly, Ball, Curry, & McMullen, 1993), age (Barton & Roy, 2008; Lilly, Ball, Curry, & McMullen, 1993), income (Lilly, Ball, Curry, & McMullen, 1993), marital status (Courtright, Berg, & Mutchnick, 2000), employment (Courtright, Berg, & Mutchnick, 2000; Lilly, Ball, Curry, & McMullen, 1993), prior offense records (Courtright, Berg, & Mutchnick, 2000), charge reduction, sentence length, prior drunk-driving records, prior drug/alcohol offenses, and prior community corrections placement (Barton & Roy, 2008).

As mentioned earlier, the purpose of this study was to investigate the "exit status" of probationers and prison-bound offenders sentenced to the EMHD program (in the Midwestern county) during the four-year study period. Hence, the outcome measure used in this study was "exit status" of those two types of convicted offenders. The following research questions were investigated in this study: (a) Were there any significant differences between the probationers and prison-bound offenders in terms of "exit status"? and (b) If so, which factors statistically significantly differentiated the "exit status" of the successful participants of the two groups?

Method

Data Sources and Subjects

The data for this study were collected from the individual offender case files maintained by the County Community Corrections Office. The subjects included in this study were 246 convicted offenders (124 probationers and 122 prison-bound offenders) sentenced to the EMHD program and having completed (either successfully or unsuccessfully) their sentences from the beginning of 2007 through the end of 2010 (four-year time period). Detailed information regarding the subjects' prior offense history and prior sanctions/placements was gathered from the criminal history information system maintained by the County Superior Court.

The following independent variables were used in this study: race (whites, coded 1; non-whites, coded 0), sex (male, coded 1; female, coded 0), age (was initially recorded as a continuous variable), education (high school or less, coded 1; more than high school, coded 0), employment (full-time, coded 1; part-time, coded 2; unemployed, coded 0), marital status (married, coded 1; not married, coded 0), offense type (felony, coded 1; misdemeanor, coded 0), drug/alcohol related offenses (yes, coded 1; not noted, coded 0), type of sentence (probation, coded 1; prison-bound, coded 0), prior offense (yes, coded 1; not noted, coded 0), prior detention [in an institution] (yes, coded 1; not noted, coded 0), prior community corrections placement (yes, coded 1; not noted, coded 0). The last one was sentence length, i.e., the number of days spent by the subjects under EMHD supervision. The data on this variable was initially recorded as a continuous variable. The dependent variable "exit status" was coded dichotomously (successful exit, coded 0; unsuccessful exit, coded 1).

The majority of the subjects were whites ($n = 212$; 86.2 percent), and male ($n = 211$; 85.8 percent). As for age, the range was 18 to 65 years, with a mean of 34.09 years. Regarding marital status, the distribution was: 131 single (53.2 percent); 54 married (22 percent); 56 divorced (22.8 percent), and 5 widowed (2 percent). The data on education revealed that 198 participants (80.5 percent) had high school or less than high school education, and the remaining 48 participants (19.5 percent) had more than high school education. Data were also collected on employment status. The distribution was: 177 employed full-time (72 percent); 45 employed part-time (18 percent), and 24 unemployed (10 percent). As

for offense type, 216 subjects (88 percent) were felons, while the remaining 30 subjects (12 percent) were misdemeanants. Regarding type of sentence, 124 subjects (50.4 percent) were probationers, while the remaining 122 subjects (49.6 percent) were prison-bound. Regarding other prior drug/alcohol offenses, the majority of the subjects ($n = 135$, or 54.9 percent) had no such records. The data on prior offenses revealed that 142 subjects (57.7 percent) had no record of prior offenses, while the remaining 104 subjects (42.3 percent) had records of prior offenses. Among the 246 subjects, 86 individuals (35 percent) had records of prior institutional detention, and 47 subjects (19.1 percent) had records of prior placements in community corrections. As for sentence length, the range was from 30 days to 739 days, with a mean of 200.84 days.

Recoding of Independent Variables

Two continuous independent variables—age and sentence length—were recoded for the purpose of data analyses. Age was categorized as: (a) Age-group I (18 to 35 years, coded 1) and (b) Age-group II (36 to 65 years, coded 0). Age-group I included 150 subjects (61 percent), while Age-group II consisted of 96 subjects (39 percent). The data on sentence length were dichotomized as: (a) Sentence length group I (up to 180 days, coded 0), and (b) Sentence length group II (181 to 739 days, coded 1). After recoding, the majority of the subjects ($n=166$ or 67.5 percent) were included in Sentence length group I; the remaining 80 subjects (32.5 percent) were in Sentence length group II.

Empirical Specifications

Correlation coefficients were calculated to test for multicollinearity among the independent variables. The coefficients were uniformly small; therefore, all the independent variables were retained for inclusion in discriminant analysis.

Given the dichotomous coding of the outcome measure "exit status" (successful/unsuccessful exit), and to find out the answers to the research questions, discriminant analysis was computed. Discriminant analysis creates a linear combination of the predictor variables that provides the best discrimination between the groups of subjects (Leech, Barrett, & Morgan, 2008). The discriminant analysis calculates the effects of the collection of predictor or independent variables on successful exit of the two groups of subjects included in this study.

Findings

As mentioned earlier, this study included 246 subjects (124 probationers and 122 prison-bound offenders). Among all the subjects, 161 individuals (65.4 percent) successfully exited the home detention program; the remaining 85 subjects (34.6 percent) failed to complete the program successfully.

To find the answers to the research questions, discriminant analysis was computed. All 13 independent variables were used in the analysis. Only 4 (see table 1) were found to be statistically significant predictors of successful exit for the subjects: age-groups ($p<.05$), prior offense ($p=.005$), prior detention ($p<.005$), and prior placement in community corrections ($p<.0005$). All 4 of the significant independent variables in the discriminant analysis identified a statistically significant difference between the two groups of subjects in successfully exiting the program.

The F-value ($F = 6.643$) was obtained from the significance test of the Mahalanobis' distance between groups. The computed significant difference between the two groups of subjects was 0.000. In other words, the significance of difference between the two groups of subjects was less than 0.0005 ($p<.0005$). The significant F value demonstrated that there was a significant difference between probationers and prison-bound offenders in successfully completing their court-ordered home detention sentences.

Overall, the discriminant analysis provided answers to the two research questions. First, there was a statistically significant difference between the two groups of subjects in successfully exiting the home detention program. Second, age-groups, prior offense, prior detention, and prior placement in community corrections—these four significant independent variables made the difference between the two groups of subjects.

Since the discriminant analysis demonstrated statistically significant difference between probationers and prison-bound offenders in successfully exiting the home detention programs, further analyses were computed for each group individually. These analyses revealed several noteworthy findings.

Regarding exit status, among the 124 probationers, 100 subjects (80.6 percent) successfully exited the program, while 24 subjects (19.4 percent) failed. In contrast, among the 122 prison-bound subjects, 61 individuals (50 percent) successfully exited; the remaining 61 subjects (50 percent) in this group failed.

TABLE 1.

Discriminant Analysis Comparing Probationers and Prison-bound Offenders for Successful Exit

Variables	Wilk's Lambda	F statistic	Significance
Age groups	.974	4.214	.04
Prior offense	.949	4.256	.005
Prior detention	.958	6.930	.003
Prior placement in community corrections	.977	3.703	.000
Difference between two groups of subjects	.469	6.643	.000

Percent correctly classified: 87%

As for age groups, a significant relationship did exist between age groups and exit status (Cramer's $V = .455$, $p < .005$). Among the 124 probationers, 85 subjects were up to 35 years of age (age-group 1) and 39 subjects older than 35, thus belonging to age-group II. In age-group I, 70 individuals (82 percent) were successful, and 15 (18 percent) failed. In age-group II, 30 individuals (77 percent) successfully exited the program, while 9 (23 percent) failed. On the other side, among the 122 prison-bound offenders, 65 subjects belonged to age group I and 57 subjects belonged to age-group II. Age group I of the prison-bound had 33 subjects (51 percent) successfully exit the program, and age group II had 28 subjects (49 percent) successful; in contrast; 32 subjects (49 percent) in age-group I and 29 subjects (51 percent) in age-group II failed.

Regarding prior offense, among the probationers, 33 subjects had prior offense records; 24 subjects (73 percent) failed to complete the program, while 9 subjects (27 percent) were successful. Compared to these 33 subjects, 91 probationers had no prior offense records; all these 91 subjects (100 percent) successfully exited from the program. Among the prison-bound offenders, 71 subjects had prior offense records; 61 (86 percent) of them failed and only 10 (14 percent) of the subjects were successful. Also, among the prison-bound offenders, 51 subjects had no such records, and all of them (100%) successfully exited from the program (Cramer's $V = .395$, $p < .005$).

Prior detention (in institutions) was the third independent variable that contributed to the significant difference between probationers and prison-bound offenders in successfully exiting the program. Twenty-three probationers had records of prior detention; all of them (100 percent) failed to complete the program. Conversely, 101

probationers had no records of prior detention; among them 100 subjects (99 percent) were successful, while only 1 subject (1 percent) failed. Among the prison-bound offenders, 63 subjects had prior detention records; 59 (94 percent) of them failed, and only 4 (6 percent) of them were successful. In contrast, 59 prison-bound offenders had no prior detention records; 57 (97 percent) of them were successful, and only 2 subjects (3 percent) failed (Cramer's $V = .298$, $p < .0005$).

As for prior placement in community corrections, 12 subjects in the probation group and 35 subjects in the prison-bound group had records of such placement. Among these subjects, 8 (67 percent) individuals in the probation group and 7 (20 percent) subjects in the other group successfully exited. Conversely, 4 (33 percent) subjects in the probation group and 28 (80 percent) subjects in the prison-bound group failed to complete the program. Compared to these subjects, 112 individuals in the probation group and 87 subjects in the prison-bound group had no records of such placement. Among these subjects, 92 (82 percent) individuals in the probation group and 60 (68 percent) individuals in the other group had successful exit from the program (Cramer's $V = .286$, $p < .0005$).

In sum, the data analyses for this study unveiled a number of noteworthy findings for the probationers and prison-bound offenders placed in the home detention program. What follows next are a discussion and conclusion on the significance of these findings.

Discussion and Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to focus on the exit status of probationers and prison-bound offenders in an electronically-monitored home-detention program administered in a Midwestern county. The present study included these two groups of adult offenders

who were convicted and sentenced to the program, and completed or failed to complete their sentences from the beginning of 2007 through the end of 2010 (a four-year study period). To be more specific, the objective of the present study was to examine whether there was significant difference between the two groups of offenders in successfully exiting the program, and if so, which factors were significant to that difference.

To answer both the research questions presented on p. 9, discriminant analysis was computed. This analysis demonstrated that there was a significant difference between the probation group and the prison-bound group in successfully completing the program. A review of previous research indicated that a number of previous studies (Roy & Barton, 2006; Roy, 1999, 1997; Brown & Roy, 1995) examined the relationship between type of referral (probation and non-probation, e.g., pretrial) and exit status. Like this one, all these studies reported that probationers were more likely to successfully complete their sentences than non-probationers.

Although the previous researchers did not compare probationers with prison-bound offenders in EMHD programs, this conclusion was supported by the finding from the present study. An examination of the two groups of subjects revealed that 100 probationers (about 81 percent) successfully completed the program compared to 61 prison-bound offenders (50 percent). Given this fact, it may be conjectured that placement of the prison-bound offenders in the EMHD program is riskier than placement of probationers, and perhaps more rigorous selection criteria for this group should be considered.

As mentioned earlier, based on the findings from the discriminant analysis, further analyses were conducted on each group of subjects individually. A discussion on all the findings is presented below.

As evident from Table 1, four independent variables—age groups, prior offense, prior detention (in institutions), and prior placement in community corrections—contributed to the significant difference between probationers and prison-bound offenders in successfully completing the home detention program. Regarding age groups, several previous researchers (Roy & Barton, 2006; Roy, 1999, 1997, 1994; Brown & Roy, 1995; Lilly et al., 1993) reported that subjects belonging to the older age group (36 and above) were more likely to complete their sentences successfully compared to their younger cohorts.

The findings from this study did not support the conclusion made by previous researchers. In both groups, younger subjects (age group I) were more successful than their older cohorts (age group II) in completing the program. A large majority of these younger subjects were employed full-time (n=115 or 76 percent), with an additional 18 percent (n= 27) employed part-time; in contrast, the age-group II, although showing a similar percentage employed part-time (n=18, or 19 percent), had only 52 subjects (54 percent) employed full-time. Given this breakdown, it may be surmised that the younger subjects had higher stakes in completing their program. However, this finding warrants further exploration.

As for prior offense records, 33 subjects in the probation group and 71 subjects in the prison-bound group had such records. This study revealed that 24 subjects (73 percent) in the probation group with prior offense records and 61 subjects (86 percent) in the prison-bound group with prior offenses failed to complete the program. This finding supports previous studies' findings that subjects with records of prior offenses were less likely to complete their program than their cohorts with no such records (Barton & Roy, 2008; Roy & Barton, 2006; Roy, 1999, 1997; Brown & Roy, 1995; Lilly et al., 1993; Kuplinski, 1990). Based on the findings from the previous research as well as the present study, placement of offenders with prior offense records in a community-based correctional program like EMHD may not be appropriate. However, the significant findings about the relationship between prior offense records of the EMHD participants and their exit status are worthy of further examination.

Previous researchers reported that offenders who had records of prior detention (in institutions) were more likely to fail out of the home detention program than their cohorts with no such records (Barton & Roy, 2008; Courtright, Berg, & Mutchnick, 2000; Brown & Roy, 1995; Roy, 1994). This previous research report was supported by the findings from the present study. In the probation group, 23 subjects had records of prior detention; all of them failed to complete the program. In the prison-bound group, 63 subjects had such records; of these, 59 (94 percent) failed. There are many possible explanations for this difference. What is clear, however, is that there is some cause for concern for successful outcome of subjects with records of prior institutionalization. This is especially disconcerting given the fact that

unsuccessful exit from the EMHD program usually results in incarceration of the subjects. As prisons become further overcrowded in the United States, the finding on prior detention is noteworthy.

Previous research findings indicated that offenders with a history of prior community corrections placement were more likely to unsuccessfully exit EMHD programs compared to their cohorts who had no such history (Roy & Barton, 2006; Brown & Roy, 1995; Roy, 1999, 1994). This previous research finding was supported by the findings on prison-bound offenders, especially. Among the 35 subjects in the prison-bound group who had histories of prior community corrections placement, 27 (80 percent) failed to complete the program.

All the findings from the present study suggest that the court might be more circumspect in sentencing prison-bound offenders to a community-based correctional program like EMHD. In particular, the court might be more discreet in sentencing to the EMHD program offenders who have records of prior offenses and prior detention (in institutions), and offenders who were previously placed in community-based correctional programs. The findings from the present study revealed that when those offenders were sentenced to the EMHD program, they were less likely to successfully complete their sentences, regardless of the type of referral (probation and prison-bound). However, each of the identified significant predictors or independent variables is worthy of further exploration.

References

- Ball, R., Huff, C., & Lilly, J. (1988). *House arrest and correctional policy: Doing time at home*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Barton, S., & Roy, S. (2008). Convicted drunk drivers in an electronic monitoring program: An exploratory study. *International Journal of Criminal Justice Sciences*, 3 (1), 28-43.
- Barry, K. P. (2009). Electronic monitoring: The future of crime control? <http://gpsmonitoring.com/blog/?p=1151>
- Baumer, T., Maxfield, M., & Mendelsohn, R. (1993). A comparative analysis of three electronically monitored home detention programs. *Justice Quarterly*, 10 (1), 121-142.
- Bloomberg, T., Waldo, G., & Burcroff, L. (1987). Home confinement and electronic surveillance. In B.R. McCarthy (Ed.), *Intermediate punishments: Intensive supervision, home confinement, and electronic surveillance* (pp. 32-41). Monsey, NY: Willow Tree Press.

- Brown, M. P., & Roy, S. (1995). Manual and electronic house arrest: An evaluation of factors related to failure. In J.O. Smykla & W.L. Selke (Eds.), *Intermediate sanctions: Sentencing in the 90s* (pp. 1-20). Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing.
- Charles, M. T. (1989). Electronic monitoring for juveniles. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, V, 147-169.
- Clarkson, J. S. & Weakland, J. J. (1991). A transitional aftercare model for juveniles: Adopting electronic monitoring and home confinement. *Journal of Offender Monitoring*, V, 2-15.
- Coopridge, K. W. (1992). Pretrial bond supervision: An empirical analysis with policy implications. *Federal Probation*, September, 41-49.
- Courtright, K. E., Berg, B. L., & Mutchnick, R. J. (2000). Rehabilitation in the new machine? Exploring drug and alcohol use and variables related to success among DUI offenders under electronic monitoring—Some preliminary outcome results. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 44 (3), 293-311.
- Di Tella, R., & Schargrodsky, E. (2009). *Criminal recidivism after prison and electronic monitoring*, NBER Working papers 15602. National Bureau of Economic Research Inc., Cambridge, MA.
- Enos, R., Black, C.M., Quinn, J.F., & Holman, J.E. (1992). *Alternative sentencing: Electronically monitored correctional supervision*. Bristol, IN: Wyndham Hall Press.
- Finn, M. A., & Muirhead-Steves, S. (2002). The effectiveness of electronic monitoring with violent male parolees. *Justice Quarterly*, 19 (2), 293-312.
- Friel, C.M., & Vaughn, J.B. (1986). A consumer's guide to the electronic monitoring of probationers. *Federal Probation*, 50, 3-14.
- Jones, R. K., & Lacey, J. H. (2000). *State of knowledge of alcohol-impaired driving: Research on repeat DWI offenders*. U.S. Department of Transportation, Washington, DC.
- Kuplinski, J. (1990). *Electronic offender monitoring in Virginia: Evaluation report*. Richmond, VA: Department of Criminal Justice Services.
- Lilly, J. R., Ball, R. A., Curry, G. D., & McMullen, J. (1993). Electronic monitoring of the drunk driver: A seven-year study of the home confinement alternative. *Crime and Delinquency*, 39 (4), 462-484.
- Lilly, J. R., Ball, R.A., Curry, G.D., & Smith, R. (1992). The Pride, Inc. Program: An evaluation of five years of electronic monitoring. *Federal Probation*, 56 (4), 42-47.

- Lilly, J. R., Ball, R. A., & Wright, J. (1987). Home incarceration with electronic monitoring in Kenton County, Kentucky: An evaluation. In B.R. McCarthy (Ed.) *Intermediate Punishments: Intensive Supervision, Home Confinement, and Electronic Surveillance* (pp. 42-56). Monsey, NY: Willow Tree Press.
- Leech, N. L., Barrett, K. C., & Morgan, G. A. (2008). *SPSS for intermediate statistics*. Psychology Press, New York.
- Minnesota Department of Corrections (2002). *Remote electronic alcohol monitoring*. St. Paul, MN.
- Palm Beach County Florida Sheriff's Department (1987). Palm Beach County's In-House Arrest Work Release Program. In B.R. McCarthy (Ed.), *Intermediate punishments: Intensive supervision, home confinement, and electronic surveillance* (pp. 181-187). Monsey, NY: Willow Tree Press.
- Renzema, M., & Skelton, D. (1990). Trends in the use of electronic monitoring. *Journal of Offender Monitoring*, 3 (3), 12-19.
- Rogers, R., & Jolin, A. (1989). Electronic monitoring: A review of the empirical literature. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 5, 141-152.
- Roy, S. (1999). An analysis of the exit status of adult offenders in an electronic monitoring home detention program in Indiana. *Journal of Offender Monitoring*, Summer, 12 (3), 8-13.
- Roy, S. (1997). Five years of electronic monitoring of adults and juveniles in Lake County, Indiana: A comparative study on factors related to failure. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 20 (1), 141-160.
- Roy, S. (1994). Adult offenders in an electronic home detention program: Factors related to failure. *Journal of Offender Monitoring*, 7 (4), 17-21.
- Roy, S., & Barton, S. (2006). Convicted drunk drivers in electronic monitoring home detention and day reporting center: An exploratory study. *Federal Probation*, 70 (1), 49-55.
- Tuthill, J. (1986). An evaluation of electronic home detention as a deterrent for offenders convicted of driving under the influence of alcohol. *Journal of Probation and Parole*, 17, 11-13.
- Vaughn, J. B. (1991). Use of electronic monitoring with juvenile intensive supervision programs. In T. Armstrong (Ed.), *Intensive supervision with high-risk youths* (pp. 189-210). Monsey, NY: Willow Tree Press.
- Vaughn, J. B. (1987). Planning for change: The use of electronic monitoring as a correctional alternative. In B. R. McCarthy (Ed.), *Intermediate punishments: Intensive supervision, home confinement, and electronic surveillance* (pp. 71-84). Monsey, NY: Willow Tree Press.
- Zhang, S. X., Polakow, R., & Nidorf, B. J. (1995). Varied uses of electronic monitoring: The Los Angeles County experience. In J. O. Smykla and W. L. Selke (Eds.), *Intermediate sanctions: Sentencing in the 90s* (pp. 95-110). Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing.

A Review of Probation Home Visits: What Do We Know?

Eileen M. Ahlin

Penn State Harrisburg

Maria João Lobo Antunes

Towson University

Heather Tubman-Carbone

Westat

HOME VISITS ARE an important yet understudied component of probation. Historically a cornerstone of probation (Lindner, 1992a), home visits provide an opportunity for probation officers to have quality contact with a client in his or her personal environment. This type of less formal interaction between offenders and their assigned officers serves not only to monitor behavior and compliance with the case plan but also to provide often-needed direction towards treatment and social services. Furthermore, though time consuming (see DeMichele, 2007), these visits allow the probation officer additional opportunities to act as a positive role model (see Braswell, 1989). Although home visits are seen as a critical tool employed by probation officers, recent evidence demonstrates that home visits are rarely conducted (see Jalbert, Rhodes, Flygare, & Kane, 2010), even for high-risk offenders who might benefit from them the most. Research on current home visit practices and policies is lacking. Knowledge about current goals of home visits, best practices, and anticipated outcomes associated with home visits is not well documented. Further, information on the qualitative nature of the home visit (Taxman, 2002) and whether these interactions have any effect on offender recidivism is scarce and out of date. Because there are costs (such as probation officer time and safety risks) associated with conducting field work, we need to understand the role of home visits in modern probation agencies and determine

best practices of how they should be implemented to meet intended goals.

This article highlights the historical importance of home visits as a key element of probation and suggests future avenues to inform the field about their full potential and utility. First, we provide a brief overview of the history of probation in the criminal justice system. Second, we outline how probation has evolved over the last century to encompass not only low-risk offenders, but also those at higher risk of recidivating and violating public safety, discussing how home visits are applicable to this population. We conclude with a discussion of gaps in our knowledge on home visits and how the field can move forward by addressing these voids in the literature and research.

A Brief History of Probation: From Rehabilitation to Crime Control and Back Again?

The use of probation can be traced to religious rites of ancient times. Such practices as right to sanctuary (Bianchi, 1994) and benefit of clergy (Levinson, 2002) were precursors to judicial reprieve (Clear, Cole, & Reisig, 2012), a widespread practice in nineteenth century England. Under English common law, convicted offenders could request suspended sentences; at the judges' discretion, their sentences would be put on hold for a specified length of time during which they had to exhibit good behavior. At the expiration of the

term, those who behaved appropriately were eligible to apply to the Crown for a pardon (Clear, Cole, & Reisig, 2012).

Rather than specifying a period of time during which offenders should remain crime free, American judges retained discretion to suspend sentences indefinitely. As long as offenders behaved in accordance with the law, they would not be punished; however, offenders who committed new crimes were subject to punishment for both the original and new offenses (Clear, Cole, & Reisig, 2012). The Supreme Court put an end to the practice of judicial reprieve in 1916 with *Ex parte United States*, 242 U.S. 27, ruling that indefinite suspension of punishment encroached on the powers of the government to enforce the rule of law and was, therefore, unconstitutional. However, the need for probationary sentences remained and the practice of recognizance emerged as less controversial.

Recognizance allowed judges to develop informal ways of exercising discretion and mitigate the harshness of common sentences by exacting more individualized punishments. Rather than holding all offenders in custody until a future court date, judges allowed some offenders to reside in their communities after extracting a promise that they perform a particular act, such as keep the peace, pay a debt, or return to court at an appointed time (Clear, Cole, & Reisig, 2012). Massachusetts was the first state to formalize this practice in 1837 by making recognizance with money sureties

into law. Under the new law, offenders who were granted recognizance would post a sum of money as surety that they would fulfill their promise to the court (e.g., pay a debt, return to court). If they complied, the money was returned, like modern-day bail (Clear, Cole, & Reisig, 2012).

The practices of judicial reprieve and recognizance, as well as their forerunners, paved the way for modern probation. Each of the practices reviewed above moved closer to a more flexible sentencing mechanism than the one before it, so that the next logical step was to formalize individualized punishment of offenders, including opportunities to visit with offenders in less formal settings such as the home. A boot maker from Massachusetts was the first person to take that step in 1841.

John Augustus, a religious man of financial means, believed that offenders could be rehabilitated and that offenders' time was better spent on activities that promoted positive change rather than in prison or jail (MacKenzie, 2011). Augustus had some experience working with alcoholics, and through his philanthropic activities he was an observer of the Boston Police Court when a man charged with being a common drunk appeared before the judge (Petersilia, 1998). Augustus asked the judge to defer sentencing and release the man into his custody for three weeks. He took the man into his home, made him sign a pledge to stop drinking, and helped him obtain employment (MacKenzie, 2011). Once the three weeks had elapsed, Augustus convinced the judge that the man was reformed and no longer deserving of punishment; the man received a nominal fine and the case was closed (MacKenzie, 2011).

Over the next 15 years, using his own money and donations from other Boston residents, Augustus posted bail for and supervised more than 1,800 people processed in the Boston courts, including 30 children (Binder, Geis, & Bruce, 1997). Augustus also offered support in multiple life domains, such as housing, employment, and education (Petersilia, 1998). Law enforcement was initially resistant to Augustus' ideas about helping offenders (Klein, 1997). At the time, some police and court officers were only paid when offenders were incarcerated; for them, Augustus' activities translated to lost wages. Over time, however, judges accepted that not all offenders needed to be incarcerated and that some offenders could actually benefit from Augustus' personalized, close-contact work with them (Klein, 1997).

Augustus carefully selected his candidates. He tended towards first-time offenders that he believed could be rehabilitated, people "whose hearts," he wrote in his autobiography, "were not wholly depraved but gave promise of better things" (Petersilia, 1998: 32). Thus were born the concepts of risk assessment and classification (MacKenzie, 2011). Augustus' selection criteria and comprehensive approach were successful: Only one of his first 1,100 charges forfeited bond (Petersilia, 1998).

Augustus' work served as the model for modern probation; however, just as probation changed over time, so did the role of the probation officer. The nature of probation and probation officers themselves has vacillated between law enforcement and social work perspectives. Early probation officers were, like John Augustus, volunteers. They were often recruited from churches or other religious groups and leaned towards the social-work end of the spectrum. Though probation officers had the power to be coercive, they rarely used it. Instead, officers viewed their role as a therapeutic one designed to help probationers live law-abiding lives by providing counseling and connections to relevant community services and treatment programs (MacKenzie, 2011), often in the context of the home. This social-work perspective of probation aligned with the philosophy of the Progressive era. However, as the use of probation increased and with it officer caseloads, the law-enforcement perspective of probation began to overtake the social-work perspective.

Jurisdictions began to create paid probation officer positions, and the first paid probation officers tended to be ex-law enforcement officers such as sheriffs and policemen who worked directly for judges (Petersilia, 1998). As a result, probation officers became the "eyes and ears of the local court" and adopted a decidedly law-enforcement approach to supervising probationers (Rothman, 1980: 244). They focused on the offense rather than on the offender, stressing the role of authority and strict adherence to the law (MacKenzie, 2011) rather than rehabilitative endeavors that helped the client. Regardless, the social-work emphasis of probation prevailed and remained largely unchallenged until the 1970s.

Despite receiving a ringing endorsement from President Johnson in the late 1960s, the rehabilitative goals of corrections in general and probation in particular came under fire in the 1970s leading to system-wide change in the 1980s (President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of

Justice, 1967; MacKenzie, 2011). Discouraging research findings, growing probation populations without a corresponding increase in probation budgets, and a call to get tough on crime shifted the focus of probation from rehabilitation to control and surveillance (Byrne, Lurigio, & Petersilia, 1992; Tonry, 1990). Amid growing caseloads, officers devoted less time to counseling and service provision. Instead, supervision activities were designed to keep the offenders in check, carefully monitoring new offenses and violations of the terms of supervision (Tonry, 1990; MacKenzie, 2011). Home visits continued, but began to support surveillance and crime control goals over rehabilitative ones. However, in recent years, and as is the cyclical nature of corrections philosophy, the focus of probation has once again turned toward rehabilitation in this era of evidence-based practice.

In fact, a growing body of research suggests that correctional paradigms focused on control and punishment are far from effective. Rather, successful programs that have demonstrated effectiveness incorporate human service elements, much like the social-work perspective on probation (MacKenzie, 2011). As a result we have witnessed a surge in research and investigations focused on determining "what works" in corrections. However, we still do not know much about the field work practice of home visits, leading to the question: *In the modern era, is the practice of home visits by probation officers important to the goals of public safety and offender rehabilitation?*

The Role of Home Visits in Supporting Probation Goals

Probation serves the dual purpose of seeking to ensure public safety and the rehabilitation of the offender (Lindner, 1992a). Home visits are one component of probation that may help achieve both purposes, since such visits can provide rehabilitation opportunities that can increase the effectiveness of community supervision (see Paparozzi & Gendreau, 2005). Under a crime control model and consistent with the goals of supervision, home visits are frequently regarded as an additional tool for monitoring probationers. However, as noted earlier, modern probation originated as a means for law-abiding citizens to develop personal relationships with offenders and provide social services using a casework management model (see Burnett & McNeill, 2005; Lindner, 1992a). Home visits are ideal for this goal of probation, because they provide probation

officers with insight into offenders' personal lives and needs (e.g., housing, social support).

In the early 1900s, personal contacts with clients were considered a fundamental component of probation (Lindner, 1992a). Over time, and particularly in the late 1970s when Martinson (1974) proclaimed that nothing worked in corrections, the criminal justice system lost its footing in social services and embraced a crime-control model focused on supervision. However, personal contacts such as home visits remain the primary way for a probation officer to monitor offender behavior through supervision (Sieh, 2003); they also offer certain advantages over office visits as a means to provide mentoring and direction to appropriate services (Lindner, 1992a). Unlike face-to-face contacts held in the probation office, home visits provide a more relaxed environment that may foster personal relationships between offender and probation officer (Braswell, 1989; Wood, 2007).

Expansion of Probation to Higher-Risk Offenders: Retaining a Role for Home Visits

While visiting with offenders in a home setting began with Augustus as a way to encourage rehabilitative efforts, home visits are currently reserved for offenders with the highest risk of recidivating, who may also have the greatest rehabilitation needs. Furthermore, these interactions are frequently a component of probation for offenders assigned to intensive supervision probation (ISP). ISP programs were created as one way to reduce skyrocketing incarceration rates in the 1980s, decrease spending on prisons, and (most relevant to home visits) control criminal offending (see Petersilia & Turner, 1993b). With incarceration rates rapidly increasing over the past few decades (Blumstein & Beck, 1999; Carson & Sabol, 2012), intermediate sanctions such as ISP were heralded as a cost-effective solution aimed at curbing the prison population while meting out proportional punishment (Tonry, 1990). Rather than incarcerate high-risk offenders, ISP retains offenders in the community under more stringent supervision than traditional probation. ISP programs typically consist of reduced caseloads for probation officers to allow them time for increased supervision using in-person contacts, including home visits, and enforcement of probation conditions.

Researchers have noted that ISP can result in an increased number of violations, particularly technical violations, over traditional

probation because of the intensive supervision component (Petersilia & Turner, 1993a). This is particularly true in the case of home visits, which are often unannounced and can serve to "catch" probationers in violation of conditions of community supervision. However, in accordance with the traditional purposes of probation, ISP does not, and should not, be reserved to increased surveillance. In 2004, Petersilia noted that ISPs "must deliver high 'doses' of both treatment and surveillance to assure public safety and reduce recidivism" (p. 497; emphasis in original). Indeed, research by Gendreau, Goggin, and Fulton (2000) demonstrates that ISP programs that combine surveillance with treatment have increased reductions in recidivism. Therefore, a balanced approach would better serve probationers and protect public safety in the long run. As such, the probation field could view home visits and other in-person contacts as a means to broker social services and promote rehabilitation efforts while also conducting law enforcement-oriented field work. Moreover, home visits offer a rare opportunity for probation officers to observe offenders in their intimate environments and how they interact with family members and other persons in their support system. These observations can also provide insight into offender needs that could be met with social services or treatment. Participation in such programs could reduce the likelihood of recidivism but also foster positive relationships and support in the lives of offenders who need them the most.

Addressing Gaps in Our Knowledge about Home Visits

As reviewed in the previous section, we know that home visits are more likely to be used for higher-risk offenders. However, much about home visits with probationers is not well documented. A review of the literature and research suggests several avenues for future inquiry and debate. In the early 1990s, Lindner (1992b) provided an in-depth overview of home visitation while cautioning that shifts in policies from rehabilitation to punishment over recent decades might eventually lead to the demise of this long-standing practice. Although his prediction has yet to come true, and rehabilitation is not dead (Cullen, 2005), there remains a paucity of research focusing on the utility of home visits and whether they serve offenders and probation officers well. It is possible that the lack of research on home

visits is due, in part, to the dearth of studies examining the role of case management in both addressing offender service needs and reducing recidivism (Taxman, 2002; Taxman, Shepardson, & Bello, 2003). Furthermore, as Bonta and colleagues (2008) submit, efforts in community supervision are more likely turned towards monitoring and surveillance rather than treatment and less focused on the quality or type of in-person contact than the quantity of that interaction. Drakeford's (1992) work on home visits underscores what was then a fairly recent shift towards control by depicting what he saw as the demise of the home visit and the slow decline of probation's social work function. Home visits, however, should not be discounted until they have been subject to rigorous scientific inquiry to determine their value to the core functions of probation: supervision and rehabilitation. In this section, we address areas for future research that, based on our review of the literature and research, could improve our understanding of home visits and whether they meet the needs and goals of probationers and probation officers.

Officer and Offender Goals for Home Visits

Researchers and practitioners would both benefit from an understanding of officers' and offenders' goals for home visits (DeMichele & Payne, 2007) and how best to gain probation officer buy-in if the probation agency promotes home visits (see Petersilia, 1990). These are the first critical steps in unpacking the importance of home visits in probation. Additionally, understanding the relationship aspect of home visits and the development of informal social bonds between offender and probation officer would greatly inform the field (see Braswell, 1989).

When examining the dynamics of probation, the focus often rests on whether probationers recidivate and what covariates predict recidivism (e.g., offense history) or on probation officers' caseload, fatigue, stress, and monitoring efforts in detecting technical violations or rearrest. All of these are primarily probation officer goals. However, from a client-centered perspective, the question of what home visits do for offenders must also be answered. Evidence suggests that offenders understand how crucial contact with their officer can be to the successful completion of their probation terms. Partridge (2004) discusses how beneficial these contacts are to offenders, especially during the first few

months on community supervision. These contacts, the author argues, help to bolster the officer-client relationship by increasing the offender's trust in his or her probation officer and opening the channels of communication that promote a healthier approach to the probation sentence. Contact between the officer and probationers can be improved through quality home visits, yet as Rothman (1980) indicates, home visitation policies are often not followed or are cursory (e.g., a drive-by verification of home address), thus hindering the rehabilitative effects of such visits on the offender. How home visits can simultaneously achieve goals relevant to probationers and probation officers is understudied, but such research could inform home visit practices.

Opening the "Black Box" of Home Visits

Anecdotal evidence suggests that home visits are ineffective and waste valuable resources (see Lindner, 1992a for a review). However, much remains to be learned about the nature of in-person contacts between probation officers and their clients (Seiter & West, 2003). Taxman (2002: 14) states that "the nature and activities of supervision are often considered inconsequential to effectiveness." The same may be said of casework and social services brokered by probation officers. However, these sentiments are unfounded without proper evaluation and an understanding of how probation officers conceive of and implement both supervision and social services in the field. Further, we have failed to uncover the "black box" of home visits or other elements of intensive supervision probation in general (see Byrne, 1990). We know that the use of home visits varies on multiple dimensions, but we do not have empirical evidence documenting these differences.

One clear conclusion that emerges from the extant research efforts is that contact between the offender and probation officer must be meaningful and not only a means of check-in or exchange of information concerning the offender's employment or housing status (Taxman, 2002). But reliable and consistent data are needed in order to move beyond the mechanical supervision context of visits. Data are needed on the length and frequency (e.g., dosage) of home visits, the qualitative nature of what occurs during a home visit, probationers' and probation officers' goals for these encounters, and whether they are accomplishing the overarching goals of probation.

Effectiveness of Home Visits

After determining what practices constitute a home visit, we need to examine whether home visits are effective, and, if so, what makes them effective. MacKenzie and colleagues (1999) echo this sentiment by cautioning that probation may reduce recidivism; however, we lack the evidence to determine what precisely about probation makes it effective. We know so little about home visits that it is difficult to assess their value without in-depth inquiry and investigation. Foremost, it is essential to determine whether home visits are directly linked to recidivism. If home visits do not have any appreciable effect on recidivism, public safety, or offender rehabilitation, their use, like that of any defunct condition of probation (see Byrne, 1990), should be revamped, reduced, or perhaps discontinued. Taxman (2002) proposes that in order to truly understand the effects of community supervision researchers must also focus on the theoretical basis for home visits. Establishing the theoretical underpinnings of home visits can assist in establishing their effectiveness.

Advocates of the surveillance/public safety role of probation see home visits as an opportunity to catch clients behaving badly, whereas those in favor of a more rehabilitative approach focus on the social-service function of the home visit and the opportunity to connect not only with the offender but with family and community members. An argument could be made for the validity of both viewpoints. In truth, as Bahn and Davis (1991) suggest, more often than not, probationers seek support from their officers in relation to educational attainment, employment, and adjustment to community supervision, while probation officers categorize home visits as related to supervision (Clear & Latessa, 1993). The question of whether home visits can serve to foster the support probationers seek or whether home visits increase public safety by reducing recidivism have yet to be demonstrated by the relevant literature. In theory, the types of support services probationers are in need of should aid desistance efforts and brokerage of services should be feasibly facilitated through home visits, while also serving supervision and surveillance goals.

Impact of Home Visits on Family and Communities

Similarly, Lindner (1992a) believes that the impact of home visits extends beyond the offender to families and communities and thus the latter should be included in any

research effort targeting home visitation. It is not clear how home visits or probation in general impacts the family of an offender beyond his or her participation as collateral contacts. Research indicates that probation can stigmatize an offender (Bahn & Davis, 1991), but scant research is available on the potential pains (e.g., increased burden on family members to support probationer's supervision requirements) or benefits (e.g., having the offender at home instead of incarcerated) of probation on the probationer's family and community. Scholars have detailed the impact that incarceration has on these contexts (e.g., Clear, 2007), while less is known about any impacts that probation, the most commonly used correctional option, has on offenders' support systems.

Dosage—How Often and How Many Home Visits Are Needed?

After research determines whether home visits are effective in meeting probation goals, it will be necessary to determine the appropriate dosage of home visits (frequency of home visits and average length of each visit) to achieve desired outcomes (e.g., reduced recidivism, increased rehabilitation). Among the 14 ISP programs evaluated by Petersilia and Turner (1993b) using a randomized experimental design, the number of monthly face-to-face contacts did not impact recidivism. Unfortunately, their data do not indicate whether the type of in-person contact matters. One hurdle to overcome is to disaggregate data and determine how many in-person contacts are home visits as opposed to office meetings, collateral contacts, employment visits, drug tests, or other face-to-face encounters and then to assess the effectiveness of each.

However, studies like that by Jalbert et al. (2010) show that the number of contacts, especially home visits, can in some instances be as rare as one time a year, which does not lend itself to successfully evaluating their effect on offender outcomes. Lindner and Bonn (1996) note the wide variation in the number of face-to-face field visits between ISP clients and those who are low-risk, but just as in Petersilia and Turner's study, whether these are home or other types of field visits is not captured. Further complicating matters, probation programs with protocols for frequent in-person contacts, either at the probation office or the offender's home, often reduce contact visits to a minimal number after a period of time (see Petersilia, 1999) or once residency is established. With such minimal in-person contact and even fewer home

contacts depicted throughout the literature, it becomes evident why it is so difficult to discern the possible value of home visits.

Desistance among High-Risk Offenders

While probation has a long history within the criminal justice system, its value within the realm of intermediate sanctions such as ISP became more salient as researchers began to further investigate the effects of probation on offender recidivism. It is critical when examining probation to keep in mind its multi-faceted goal of punishment, prison population reduction, and, to an extent, offender desistance from crime. Home visits as a component of ISPs are rarely discussed in any depth, with more focus typically placed on other options offered by the menu of sanctions, such as electronic monitoring, fines, house arrest, and community service. However, home visits attend to the original intent of probation much more than any other aspect of a probation sentence, even though home visits are often categorized by probation officers as supervision or surveillance-related tasks (see Clear & Latessa, 1993; West & Seiter, 2004). While the potential of home visits for promoting desistance can be great, it is still largely unknown.

Conclusion

Twenty years ago Petersilia and Turner (1993b) advocated for researchers to uncover the effects of the various elements of ISPs; This question remains unanswered today (see also Byrne, 1990), particularly as it relates to home visits among probationers. Lindner (1992b) suggested that home visits were no longer a prevalent part of probation work and identified increased workload, higher-risk probationers, and safety concerns as the main reasons for their decline (see also Lindner & Bonn, 1996). Sadly, it is these higher-risk probationers who would likely benefit the most from home visits. In order to best serve an increasing population of probationers, it is vital for the criminal justice community to formally investigate the effects home visits have on all parties involved and to balance the focus on supervision and surveillance with treatment and rehabilitation (Petersilia, 2004; Sieh, 2003), specifically treatment and rehabilitation that focus on criminogenic needs highly predictive of recidivism (see Gendreau, Little, & Goggin, 1996).

Based on the sparse literature and research on home visits among probationers that is available and on probation research in general,

we have identified 12 areas of inquiry that could provide much-needed information to give context and depth to modern home visits as a function of probation. They are:

1. Investigate how case management relates to offender rehabilitation.
2. Determine the underlying function of modern supervision: supervision or casework.
3. Develop a theoretical basis for home visits.
4. Examine the impact of home visits on the family and community of probationers.
5. Uncover why officers spend a small proportion of time on the delivery of interventions that adhere to the risk-need-responsivity model.
6. Determine the appropriate dosage of home visits (frequency and length of home visits) necessary to achieve desired outcomes (e.g., reduced recidivism, increased rehabilitation).
7. Understand probation officers' and probationers' goals for home visits.
8. Investigate how a trusting and collaborative officer-offender relationship is developed.
9. Document promising practices in home visits.
10. Uncover the relationship between home visits and offender outcomes, not limited to recidivism.
11. Assess effectiveness of home visits for low- and high-risk offenders.
12. Assess costs associated with conducting home visits and evaluate cost-effectiveness of current practices.

At present it is not clear if we can answer the question posed by this article: Are home visits a practice best left in the past, or do they provide a mechanism for meeting the varied goals of probation? Addressing these voids in the probation literature would improve researchers' and practitioners' understanding of home visits. A recent National Institute of Justice solicitation seeks to address the gaps regarding the role of home visits in modern probation and move the field forward.

References

- Bahn, C., & Davis, J.R. (1991). Social-psychological effects of the status of probationer. *Federal Probation*, 55, 17-24.
- Bianchi, H. (1994). *Justice as sanctuary: Toward a new system of crime control*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Binder, A., Geis, G., & Bruce, Jr., D.D. (1997). *Juvenile delinquency: Historical, cultural and legal perspectives, instructor's guide*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.

- Blumstein, A., & Beck, A.J. (1999). Population growth in U.S. prisons, 1980-1996. *Crime and Justice*, 26, 17-62.
- Bonta, J., Ruge, T., Scott, T.L., Bourgon, G., & Yessine, A.K. (2008). Exploring the black box of community supervision. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 47, 248-270.
- Braswell, M.C. (1989). Correctional treatment and the human spirit: A focus on relationship. *Federal Probation*, 53, 49-60.
- Burnett, R., & McNeill, F. (2005). The place of the officer-offender relationship in assisting offenders to desist from crime. *The Journal of Community and Criminal Justice*, 52, 221-242.
- Byrne, J. (1990). The future of intensive probation supervision and the new intermediate sanctions. *Crime & Delinquency*, 36, 6-41.
- Byrne, J.M., Lurigio, A.J., & Petersilia, J. (1992). *Smart sentencing: The emergence of intermediate sanctions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Carson, E.A., & Sabol, W.J. (2012). *Prisoners in 2011*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Clear, T.R. (2007). *Imprisoning communities: How mass incarceration makes disadvantaged neighborhoods worse*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Clear, T.R., & Latessa, E.J. (1993). Probation officers' roles in intensive supervision: Surveillance versus treatment. *Justice Quarterly*, 10, 441-462.
- Clear, T.R., Cole, G.F., & Reisig, M.D. (2012). *American corrections*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Cullen, F.T. (2005). The twelve people who saved rehabilitation: How the science of criminology made a difference. *Criminology*, 43, 1-42.
- DeMichele, M. (2007). Probation and parole's growing caseloads and workload allocation: Strategies for managerial decision making. Lexington, KY: American Probation & Parole Association.
- DeMichele, M., & Payne, B.K. (2007). Probation and parole officers speak out—Caseload and workload allocation. *Federal Probation*, 71, 30-35.
- Drakeford, M. (1992). Quietly, but not at home. *Probation Journal*, 39, 202-204.
- Gendreau, P., Goggin, C., & Fulton, B. (2000). Intensive probation in probation and parole settings. Pp. 195-204 in *Handbook of offender assessment and treatment*, edited by C.R. Hollin. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Gendreau, P., Little, T., & Goggin, C. (1996). A Meta-analysis of the predictors of adult offender recidivism: What works! *Criminology*, 34, 575-607.

- Jalbert, S.K., Rhodes, W., Flygare, C., & Kane, M. (2010). Testing probation outcomes in an evidence-based practice setting: Reduced caseload size and intensive supervision effectiveness. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 49, 233-253.
- Klein, A.R. (1997). *Alternative sentencing, intermediate sanctions and probation*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.
- Levinson, D. (Ed.). (2002). *Encyclopedia of crime and punishment* (Vol. 1). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lindner, C. (1992a). The probation field visit and office report in New York State: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Criminal Justice Review*, 17, 44-60.
- Lindner, C. (1992b). The refocused probation home visit: A subtle but revolutionary change. *Federal Probation*, 56, 16-21.
- Lindner, C., & Bonn, R.L. (1996). Probation officer victimization and fieldwork practices: Results of a national study. *Federal Probation*, 60, 16-23.
- MacKenzie, D. (2011). Probation: An untapped resource in U.S. corrections. Pp. 97-128 in *Rethinking corrections: Rehabilitation, reentry, and reintegration*, edited by L. Gideon & H-E. Sung. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- MacKenzie, D.L., Browning, K., Skroban, S.B., & Smith, D.A. (1999). The impact of probation on the criminal activities of offenders. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 36, 423-453.
- Martinson, R. (1974). What works? Questions and answers about prison reform. *The Public Interest*, 35, 22-54.
- Paparozzi, M.A., & Gendreau, P. (2005). An intensive supervision program that worked: Service delivery, professional orientation, and organizational supportiveness. *The Prison Journal*, 85, 445-466.
- Partridge, S. (2004). *Examining case management models for community sentences*. Home Office Online Report 17/04, London, Home Office.
- Petersilia, J. (1990). Conditions that permit intensive supervision programs to survive. *Crime & Delinquency*, 36, 126-145.
- Petersilia, J. (1998). Probation in the United States. *Perspectives*. American Probation and Parole Association.
- Petersilia, J. (1999). A decade of experimenting with intermediate sanctions: What have we learned? *Justice Research and Policy*, 1, 9-23.
- Petersilia, J. (2004). Community corrections. Pp. 483-508 in *Crime: Public policies for crime control*, edited by J.Q. Wilson and J. Petersilia. Oakland, CA: Institute for Contemporary Studies.
- Petersilia, J., & Turner, S. (1993a). *Evaluating intensive supervision probation/parole: Results of a nationwide experiment*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Petersilia, J., & Turner, S. (1993b). Intensive probation and parole. *Crime and Justice*, 17, 281-335.
- President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. (1967). *The challenge of crime in a free society*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Rothman, D.J. (1980). *Conscience and convenience: The asylum and its alternatives in progressive America*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown & Company.
- Seiter, R.P., & West, A.D. (2003). Supervision styles in probation and parole: An analysis of activities. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 38, 57-75.
- Sieh, E.W. (2003). A theoretical basis for handling technical violations. *Federal Probation*, 67, 28-32.
- Taxman, F. (2002). Supervision—Exploring the dimensions of effectiveness. *Federal Probation*, 66, 14-27.
- Taxman, F.S., Shepardson, E., & Bello, M. (2003). Reframing supervision with “what works” principles: An implementation guideline. *Paper Presented at the Annual Conference of the International Community Corrections Association*.
- Tonry, M. (1990). *Between prison and probation: Intermediate punishments in a rational sentencing system*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- West, A.D., & Seiter, R.P. (2004). Social worker or cop? Measuring the supervision styles of probation and parole officers in Kentucky and Missouri. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 27, 27-57.
- Wood, D. (2007). *Why home visit? An analysis of offender and staff attitudes to home visitation in probation practice*. Thesis. Liverpool Hope University.

From the Archives (Federal Probation May–June 1937): Is There a Measure of Probation Success?

Bennet Mead

Statistician, U.S. Department of Justice

IS THERE A Measure of Probation Success? Before attempting to answer this question let us first define its meaning. This may best be done by first determining what constitutes probation success, and then considering possible methods of measuring such success.

In defining the meaning of probation success, it should first be emphasized that success is positive in its nature. Most people undoubtedly conceive of success as something far more vital than mere absence of failure. The sort of success which is no more than absence of failure, becomes a pale shadow of success, a mediocre thing scarcely better than failure.

It follows, that no satisfactory measure of probation success can be obtained merely by counting up those definite and obvious failures who are customarily referred to as probation violators, or by determining the ratio of such violators to the entire group handled on probation. This may be illustrated by some recent statistics from the experience of the Probation System of the United States Courts. During the year ending June 30, 1936, there were 997 Federal probationers who were officially declared violators, either by revocation of their probation, by their arrest, or by issuance of warrants for their arrest on charges constituting violation of the terms of their probation. During that same year, a total of 29,821 persons were at one time or another under the supervision of United States Probation officers. If we calculate the ratio of violators to the total number handled on probation, we find that in the fiscal year 1935-36, the violators formed 3.3 per cent of the total handled.

Now this percentage does measure, after a fashion, the frequency of failure on probation,

and thus it affords a crude negative measure of probation success. That is, we may say that during the year under consideration, and so far as official records are concerned, the entire group of probationers supervised, exclusive of those formally declared violators, are to be considered as probation successes. On this basis, the United States Probation System might rashly claim that 96.7 per cent of its cases on probation were handled successfully, and we might then go further and jump recklessly to the conclusion that all is well with us, and that the federal probation system is discharging as effectively as possible its task of rehabilitating the probationers under its care.

If, however, we keep in mind the true concept of success, as positive achievement rather than dead-level mediocrity, we must admit that this 96.7 per cent of alleged success does not and cannot reveal the actual extent of our achievement or lack of achievement. So long as we do not actually know whether our so-called "successes" involve any real improvement in the behavior of the probationers, we must not allow ourselves to become complaisant about the situation.

On any realistic basis, then, success must be considered as relative and variable. If therefore, we propose to measure success, we need to determine not only the bare fact of improvement in behavior, but also the degree of improvement.

Our analysis thus far has led to the definition of success as positive achievement, varying in degree. We have also incidentally discussed one unsatisfactory measure of probation success, the percentage of non-violators. It remains now to consider what better methods are available for measuring

probation success, that is, the degree or extent of improvement. Nearly three years ago, in the Central Office of the United States Probation System, we began to experiment with a very crude and approximate device for measuring the degree of probation success. This device consists in asking the probation officers to estimate for each probationer passed from supervision the degree of his improvement while on probation.

In undertaking this experiment, we frankly recognized that this device was in no sense an accurate or scientific measuring device. But it seemed to us that it would be worthwhile to experiment with it, primarily as a means for insuring some systematic self-criticism by the federal probation officers of their own work and its results. There is no question that this plan has been of value from this point of view.

Up to the present time, however, we have hesitated to publish any actual statistics based upon these reports on outcomes. It has been apparent from our critical examination of them, that no uniform standards have been applied by the various officers in forming their judgment as to the degree of improvement in their charges. While this advice has had considerable educational value, we must admit that it has not served as an accurate measure of success.

Perhaps we can gain some idea of the inadequacies of this measuring device by looking at some of the results obtained by it for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936. Probation officers were asked to rate the outcome of probationary treatment for those passed from their supervision in one of five degrees, as showing striking improvement, moderate improvement, slight improvement, no improvement,

or as violating probation. Out of a total of 6,298 cases thus classified 1,685 or 26.8 per cent were classed as having achieved striking improvement, and 2,183 or 34.7 percent were classed in the moderate improvement group. It would, however, be most unsafe to accept these figures as giving a true picture. Rather do they indicate over-optimism on the part of the probation officers making the evaluation.

The greatest deficiency of this method of measuring success is its subjective quality, for it suffers two-fold, in that it relies not only on a man's judgment of another man, but also on a man's judgment of himself and his own work. In this connection, it is interesting to note, that over-optimism in regard to results is not limited to the less trained and qualified probation officers. In order to check this point, we compared the rating of outcome for fourteen selected probation units. The comparison for these selected units and for all other units is very interesting, because it shows no marked variation. In the totals we find that the selected units reported 24.2 percent of their cases as showing striking improvement. The remaining units classified 27.5 per cent of their cases in this group. The figures for the "moderate improvement" group reveal a similar situation, with 34.1 per cent of the cases reported by the selected units in this group, and 34.8 per cent of the cases for the remaining units in this group. Thus we see that the mass results obtained with this device differ only slightly whatever may be the quality of the personnel. It is apparent that the difficulty lies in basic weaknesses of our measuring instrument, in that ratings are made on a subjective or "hunch" basis.

It is probable that this method could be improved by making the classification of outcomes the special responsibility of some one member of each probation staff, who would be more capable of a judicial viewpoint than the officer in charge of a particular case. I believe that we should continue to experiment with this device, if possible introducing changes which will lead to greater uniformity and accuracy in the results. But even if we were successful in refining this procedure of self-evaluation which I have just described, it would still be far from adequate.

Before a reliable evaluation of outcomes can be made, it is necessary that probation departments institute a thorough system of case study for each individual who comes under supervision. No plan of evaluation can be considered accurate which does not reveal what types of cases are better and worse in

terms of social adjustment at the end of the probation period. The individual offender, then, must be the unit of evaluation, and it follows that the case study method should be used whenever possible.

Many probation departments may have been frightened away from this method of approach because of a mistaken view as to the minimum requirements in personnel and organization for this type of work. Any department which has a trained and qualified staff could at least experiment with the case study method of evaluation, by selecting a part of its cases for intensive supervision and study.

In order to use the case study method to best advantage, it is necessary to design a special form of case summary to bring together data which will show the status of the probationer at various times. This progress record should start with detailed information on the status of the offender at the time he is placed on probation, with records of his physical and mental condition, education, recreational habits, industrial experience, and family and community conditions. Similar analyses should be made at various intervals during the probation period, at the time of discharge, and if feasible, a year or more after discharge. The progress record should also cover the facts about the treatment program, as it was attempted and as it was actually executed, and any changes in the behavior of the probationer.

The purpose of such a progress record as the one outlined will be to compare the status of an individual at various times during the probation period rather than to compare two individuals at any given time. At first, it will probably be necessary to treat every personality phase separately. In this way, we may be able to record changes in the personality of the probationer, and also to compare individuals in regard to social attitudes and usefulness. Some psychologists now claim to have developed personality rating scales which test emotional as well as intellectual factors.

We must bear in mind that even after the progress record has been made available for practical use, it will not work automatically. On the contrary, a high degree of technical skill will be necessary to secure accurate and consistent results. Likewise the analysis and interpretation of these records will require much statistical training and experience. The task of evaluation will require effective collaboration between a number of professional groups, including experts in vocational guidance and education, psychologists,

psychiatrists, doctors, prison and probation administrators, as well as experts in social research. It is only through this many-sided approach that we can hope to achieve a truly significant evaluation, for no one professional group is capable of fulfilling this task without the assistance of many others.

The system of classification in the federal prison system follows the general theory I have outlined, in dealing with offenders admitted to the institution. But no such procedure has as yet been instituted for the Federal Probation System. However, there are in the country some few probation departments which attempt this type of work. I understand that the Probation Department in the Court of General Sessions of New York City follows in general the principles here outlined, as do the Probation offices of the Essex County, New Jersey, Court of Common Pleas and the Westchester County, New York, Probation Department, to mention only a few.

Agencies and institutions dealing with crime and delinquency have generally lagged far behind certain other social organizations in the use of measuring devices, specifically in the creation of adequate evaluation techniques. We must recognize that the approximate methods of evaluation in use at the present time have serious limitations. All probation workers are aware of the complexity of the crime problem. They have ample opportunity to know from actual experience that economic insecurity and unemployment, low incomes, poor housing, degrading family and neighborhood life and their surrounding conditions foster the growth and the spread of crime and delinquency.

It is necessary that we see probation in its proper relation to all the other essential elements in a program of crime control. We must not expect too much from this device, nor must we be content with too little. It seems to me reasonable to hope that thorough, scientific evaluation of probation work may disclose further facts about the underlying social and economic causes of crime and thus stimulate action for crime prevention. Even though as yet we have not put into practice methods of probation evaluation which can be relied upon, the ultimate ends to be gained in devising a satisfactory system of this kind warrant all the effort and attention we can give it.

At the time when we introduced the reporting of degree of improvement in the United States Probation System, we realized clearly the need for providing some yardstick or standard which would help the probation officers

to make their estimates of improvement on the basis of the specific nature of the improvement needed in each case. Accordingly we introduced at the same time, beginning in July, 1934, the plan of having the probation officers report, for each probationer received for supervision, the particular obstacles and handicaps affecting the probationer, which need to be overcome if the case were to be successfully handled.

For the fiscal years ending June 30, 1935 and 1936, we have tabulated and included in our annual reports summaries of the information furnished by probation officers concerning handicaps and obstacles. This appraisal of handicaps and obstacles should in the course of time enable the probation officers to make more accurate judgments as to the degree of improvement, since the information concerning initial obstacles and handicaps should be available in the case records for increasing numbers of probationers who are passed from supervision. Up to the present time, however, the record of obstacles and handicaps has not been available for the large majority of probationers passed

from supervision. This condition may help to explain some of the deficiencies in rating the degree of improvement.

In conclusion, we may summarize by saying that we have undertaken to define the meaning of probation success and to determine what methods are available for measuring probation success. We have defined success for the purposes of this discussion as being positive in its nature and decidedly variable in its degree. This has led us to the conclusion that we cannot measure success by counting up the percentage of failure, and that mere probation violation rates are therefore of very little use for measuring probation success.

We have briefly reviewed the experience of the United States Probation System in attempting to measure probation success by classifying probationers at the end of their periods of supervision according to the degree of improvement in their behavior, as judged by the federal probation officers. This experimental procedure we have found to be of educational value, but of no real scientific value. The failure of this device to yield satisfactory results has apparently been due to the unavoidable tendency of

our probation officers, in common with other mortals, to be over-optimistic in appraising the results of their own work. None the less, this device has proven of sufficient value to suggest that it should be refined and improved rather than abandoned.

Ultimately the measurement of degree of improvement needs to be done by persons other than the officers responsible for case supervision and the rating needs to be done in terms of careful appraisal of the improvement made in terms of specific traits of personality and specific phases of conduct.

Some progress has been made, but a tremendous amount of work remains to be done before we can hope to make any scientific evaluation of outcomes. The keeping of systematic and detailed records of the status and the progress of each probationer from the time he is placed on probation will pave the way for increasingly accurate measurement of the degree of success of individual probationers.

Paper presented at annual meeting of the National Probation Association, in Indianapolis, Indiana, May 21, 1937.

JUVENILE FOCUS

ALVIN W. COHN, D.CRIM.

Administration of Justice Services, Inc.

New OJJDP Administrator

Robert L. Listenbee, Jr., J.D., has assumed the role of Administrator of OJJDP. Mr. Listenbee, a graduate of Harvard University and the Boalt Hall School of Law at the University of California, Berkeley, is a highly respected public defender and juvenile justice system reformer. In 2011, Mr. Listenbee was appointed to the Federal Advisory Committee on Juvenile Justice, which advises the President, Congress, and the OJJDP Administrator on juvenile justice policy. As co-chair of the Attorney General's National Task Force on Children Exposed to Violence, Mr. Listenbee was instrumental in the development of recently released recommendations for a national response to address children's exposure to violence. Before joining OJJDP, Mr. Listenbee was a trial lawyer at the Defender Association of Philadelphia for 27 years and chief of the Juvenile Unit for 16 years. In 2011, the MacArthur Foundation's Models for Change initiative honored Mr. Listenbee with a Champion for Change award for his contributions to juvenile justice reform in Pennsylvania.

Hate Crimes

Most hate crimes are unreported to the police, according to the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS), which has released *Hate Crime Victimization, 2003–2011* (NCJ 241291). The study presents annual counts and rates of hate crime victimization that occurred from 2003 through 2011, using data from the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS).

Sexual Violence

Sexual violence against females from 1995 to 2010 declined, according to the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS), which has released *Female Victims of Sexual Violence, 1994–2010* (NCJ 240655). The study presents trends in the rate of completed or attempted rape or

sexual assault against females from 1995 to 2010. The report examines demographic characteristics of female victims of sexual violence and characteristics of the offender and incident, including victim-offender relationship, whether the offender had a weapon, and the location of the victimization.

Jail Mortality Rates

The Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) has released *Mortality in Local Jails and State Prisons, 2000–2010—Statistical Tables* (NCJ 239911), which presents national and state-level data on the number of inmate deaths that occurred in local jails and state prisons, and includes aggregated data on deaths in federal prisons.

Stranger Violence

The Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) has released *Violent Victimization Committed by Strangers, 1993–2010* (NCJ 239424), which presents findings on the rates and levels of violent victimization committed by offenders who were strangers to the victims, including homicide, rape, sexual assault, robbery, aggravated assault, and simple assault.

Date Aggression

Most teenagers do not experience physical aggression when they date. However, for some teens, abuse is a very real part of dating relationships (Teen Dating Violence: A Closer Look at Adolescent Romantic Relationships, National Institute of Justice, 2008). Studies investigating the effectiveness of programs to prevent dating violence are beginning to show positive results. Most programs focus on changing knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors linked with dating violence and also address the skills needed to build healthy relationships. In one rigorous National Institute of Justice-funded study, for example, school-level

interventions reduced dating violence by up to 50 percent in 30 New York City public middle schools (*Prevention and Intervention of Teen Dating Violence*, National Institute of Justice).

VAWA

The Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) defines dating violence as violence committed by a person who is or has been in a social relationship of a romantic or intimate nature with the victim and where the existence of such a relationship shall be determined based on a consideration of the following factors:

- The length of the relationship.
- The type of relationship.
- The frequency of interaction between the persons involved in the relationship.

From 2004 through 2009, Congress designated the first full week in February as National Teen Dating Violence Awareness and Prevention Week. Beginning in 2010, the U.S. Department of Justice worked with the Senate to designate the entire month of February as National Teen Dating Violence Awareness and Prevention Month.

To help bring greater awareness of the dangers of teen dating violence, NCJRS has prepared the Teen Dating Violence Special Feature, an online compilation of publications and resources on the topic.

Criminal Justice Research

NIJ has released the ninth issue of the *Research Report Digest*, a publication that presents brief descriptions of studies in various criminal justice disciplines, such as criminology and forensic sciences, and evaluations of technologies in the law enforcement and corrections fields. This issue includes reports based on NIJ-funded research that were added to the NCJRS Abstracts Database from July through September 2012.

Video Games

A study recently published in the journal *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice* argues that there may be a link between violent video games and aggressive juvenile behavior. The study analyzed the video game-playing behaviors of more than 200 young men and women involved in Pennsylvania's juvenile justice system. According to the report, inclinations towards more violent games, as well as frequency of playing video games in general, may be factors in both delinquent and violent behavior among young people.

OJJDP Statistical Briefing Book

Developed by the National Center for Juvenile Justice for OJJDP, the Statistical Briefing Book offers easy access to statistics on a variety of juvenile justice topics. Its data analysis tools allow users to create custom analyses of juvenile populations, arrests, court cases, and residential placement. In addition to providing juvenile population estimates for the years between censuses (2000-09), the book updates answers to frequently asked questions on the following:

- Demographics of this population (living arrangements, teen mothers, poverty).
- Juvenile arrests and trends in arrest rates (updated to include data from 2010).
- Data on state statutes (as of the 2011 legislative session).

Developmental Approach to Juvenile Justice

The National Academies' National Research Council has released "Reforming Juvenile Justice: A Developmental Approach." The report presents the findings of a two-year independent study of the juvenile justice system commissioned by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Researchers examined recent advances in behavioral and neuroscience research with regard to adolescent development and offending and recommend that this scientific knowledge be incorporated into juvenile justice reform efforts nationwide. See "Reforming Juvenile Justice: A Developmental Approach."

Juveniles in Residential Placement

OJJDP, through the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data, has released the Survey of Youth in Residential Placement (SYRP) 2003. SYRP collects data from youth in the juvenile justice system ages 10-20. The survey

asked youth about their backgrounds, offense histories, experiences in the confinement facility, their use of alcohol and drugs, their medical needs and the services they received, and any experiences of victimization in placement. SYRP joins the OJJDP-sponsored Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement (CJRP) and the Juvenile Residential Facility Census (JRFC) for updated statistics on youth in the juvenile justice system.

Youth Screening

The National Youth Screening & Assessment Project (NYSAP) has published *Risk Assessment in Juvenile Justice: A Guidebook for Implementation*. This comprehensive guide draws on years of research and actual experiences implementing risk assessment in juvenile justice settings as part of the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation's Models for Change Initiative. It provides practical insights and a structure for jurisdictions, juvenile probation, or centralized statewide agencies striving to implement risk assessment or to improve their current risk assessment practices. The publication can be accessed at: http://escholarship.umassmed.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1601&context=psych_cmhsr. The appendices for this publication can be accessed at: http://escholarship.umassmed.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?filename=0&article=1601&context=psych_cmhsr&type=additional.

Youth Solitary Confinement

The American Civil Liberties Union and Human Rights Watch have released "Growing Up Locked Down: Youth in Solitary Confinement in Jails and Prisons Across the United States." The report, which details the physical, psychological, and developmental harm that solitary confinement causes youth incarcerated in adult jails and prisons, is drawn from interviews and correspondence with youth and detention officials. Watch a video of youth describing their experiences in solitary confinement.

Children Exposed to Violence

Attorney General Eric Holder recently outlined initial steps to implement the recommendations of the National Task Force on Children Exposed to Violence, part of his Defending Childhood Initiative to address children's exposure to violence. As his first action, the Attorney General announced that

Acting Associate Attorney General Tony West will oversee the creation of an American Indian/Alaska Native (AI/AN) task force on children exposed to violence. The proposed task force will be a joint effort between the Departments of Justice and the Interior and tribal governments. The task force will focus on improving the identification and treatment of AI/AN children exposed to violence, supporting communities and tribes as they define their own responses to this problem, and involving tribal youth in developing solutions.

The National Task Force on Children Exposed to Violence presented its final report and recommendations to the Attorney General in December 2012, calling for universal identification, assessment, and treatment of children who witness or are victims of violence. The recommendations also called for training professionals who work with children to identify and respond to the trauma caused to children when they witness or are victims of violence. The Justice Department will provide additional details on the implementation of the recommendations in the coming months. These efforts will build on the national task force's call to support the field, raise public awareness, build knowledge, and increase Department and federal coordination and capacity. More information about the recommendations of the Attorney General's National Task Force on Children Exposed to Violence is available online.

Juvenile Justice Reform

Three key reports that examine recent developments in juvenile justice reform were recently released:

- "Juvenile Justice Reform in Connecticut: How Collaboration and Commitment Have Improved Public Safety and Outcomes for Youth," by the Justice Policy Institute, describes and draws lessons from Connecticut's juvenile justice reform success, which includes raising the age of juvenile jurisdiction from 15 years old to 18 years old, evidence-based treatment programs for youth, and improved conditions in juvenile facilities.
- "Reducing Youth Incarceration in the United States," by the Annie E. Casey Foundation, examines the recent decline in youth confinement and suggests ways to both reduce incarceration and help young people who are involved in the justice system.

- “Raising the Age of Juvenile Court Jurisdiction,” by the Illinois Juvenile Justice Commission, recommends that Illinois expand the jurisdiction of its juvenile courts to include 17-year-olds charged with felonies. View and download “Raising the Age of Juvenile Court Jurisdiction” online. Read about the OJJDP and MacArthur Foundation private-public partnership to support Models for Change, a national juvenile justice reform initiative.

Underage Drinkers

OJJDP has released, “Community Supervision of Underage Drinkers” (NCJ 237147). The authors provide a theoretical overview on which to base policies, procedures, and practices that will help professionals—and their corresponding agencies—effectively supervise underage drinkers in the community. They also discuss the legal issues that professionals may encounter when working with these youth. This bulletin is part of OJJDP’s Underage Drinking series, which underscores the dangers of underage drinking and provides guidelines to assist communities in developing treatment and prevention programs.

Inmate Sexual Victimization

The Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) has released *Sexual Victimization in Prisons and Jails Reported by Inmates, 2011-12* (NCJ 241399). This report presents data from BJS’s third National Inmate Survey (NIS-3), conducted between February 2011 and May 2012 in 233 state and federal prisons, 358 local jails, and 15 special correctional facilities operated by Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), the U.S. military, and correctional authorities in Indian country, with a sample of 92,449 inmates age 18 or older and 1,738 inmates ages 16 to 17.

Court Diversion Video

The Vermont Association of Court Diversion Programs has posted a new online video that explains how Vermont’s court diversion program, an alternative to the traditional court system, works. The 9-minute video highlights how the program’s restorative justice approach benefits participants and the community. Approximately 10 percent of misdemeanor charges in Vermont are handled through diversion, at significant savings to the state; participants who successfully complete the program avoid a criminal conviction. The video is one of three finalists in the Media for a Just Society Awards “Web” category.

Sexual Assault Kit

NIJ’s Nancy Ritter explains the underlying issues behind why so many sexual assault kits go untested in “Untested Evidence in Sexual Assault Cases.” Should we test every kit, even ones that are 25 years old? Or should we prioritize them? How do we decide? What about cases in which the alleged perpetrator is already known? Is there value in testing those? Ritter explains where the weak spots are in collecting, storing, and testing kits; why the police might not send sexual assault kits to be tested; and what early evidence is showing about complex issues such as victim notification. “Untested Evidence in Sexual Assault Cases” first appeared in *Sexual Assault Report*, a publication of the Civic Research Institute, which has recently made it available to the public.

Community Corrections Connect

The American Probation and Parole Association (APPA), in conjunction with the Institute for Public Safety Partnerships (IPSP) and with funding from the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA), has announced the public launch of a new online professional development networking site designed specifically for community corrections professionals: Community Corrections Connect (CC Connect). Once logged into CC Connect, users can do the following:

- Join the conversation in topical discussion forums such as Research to Practice.
- Participate in training discussion forums associated with some of the online courses and classroom-based courses produced by APPA.
- Subscribe for email alerts when new comments are posted in your favorite forums.
- View a list of free online courses developed as a component of Community Corrections Connect.
- Visit the File Gallery to view and download resources posted by Community Corrections Connect members.
- View (and subscribe to) the CC Connect blog. To find out how to register, go to www.appa.cequick.com/data/appa/ccconnect_homepageinstructions.pdf

Firearms Victimitizations

The Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) has released *Firearm Violence, 1993–2011* (NCJ 241730), which presents trends on the number and rate of fatal and nonfatal firearm violence from 1993 to 2011. The report examines

incident and victim demographic characteristics of firearm violence, including the type of firearm used; victim’s race, age, and sex; and incident location.

PREA

The Department of Justice recently released the Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) Standards Auditing Instrument for Prisons and Jails. This instrument will be used by DOJ-certified PREA auditors in adult prisons and jails to determine levels of compliance with the PREA standards, which were published in 2012. This instrument is the first of four instruments forthcoming from DOJ, each pertaining to the separate concentrations of the PREA standards: Prison and Jails, Juvenile Facilities, Community Corrections, and Police Lock-ups. The auditing instrument is accessible through the PREA Resource Center website at <http://www.prearesourcecenter.org/library/search?keys=PREA+Audit+Instrument&cat=All>.

Youth Justice Websites

Global Youth Justice, in conjunction with the American Bar Association and its celebration of Law Day, is helping local youth courts in 41 states launch 250 websites to promote their juvenile justice diversion programs. More than 1,400 communities and tribes worldwide currently operate a youth justice program associated with their local peer, student, youth, or teen courts. These courts train teenagers to be judges, prosecutors, attorneys, and jurors who handle low-level offenses of their peers, promote accountability, provide access to youth resources, and model peer leadership.

Children Exposed to Violence

Print copies of the “Report of the Attorney General’s National Task Force on Children Exposed to Violence” are now available. The Attorney General commissioned this report as part of the Defending Childhood Initiative. It details the findings and 56 policy recommendations of the National Task Force on Children Exposed to Violence and is a blueprint for reducing the impact of trauma on children who witness or experience violence.

OJJDP Statistical Briefing Book

OJJDP has released the first in a series of national overviews that describe where states stand on a variety of juvenile justice issues, including how they classify status offenses, extended age of jurisdiction, and

administration of community supervision and aftercare services. The overviews are available via the Juvenile Justice System, Structure, and Process FAQ section of OJJDP's Statistical Briefing Book (see questions marked "New"). Developed by the National Center for Juvenile Justice for OJJDP, the Briefing Book offers easy access to statistics on a variety of juvenile justice topics. Its data analysis tools allow users to create custom analyses of juvenile populations, arrests, court cases, and residential placement. The Briefing Book includes:

- FBI Arrest Statistics through 2010, including arrest rates for juveniles.
- Juvenile Court Statistics between 1985 and 2010.
- Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) on Juveniles in Court and Juveniles on Probation to 2010.

In addition, FAQs in the Juvenile Justice Structure and Process resource section have been reorganized and new FAQs have been added, including state comparisons on how probation and aftercare are administered.

Victimization Survey

BJS has published an application programming interface (API) that provides access to the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) dataset in open, machine-readable formats. The NCVS API is a dynamic feed that allows developers and researchers to retrieve up-to-date information efficiently, in the manner that best suits their needs. Access this dataset at <http://www.bjs.gov/developer/ncvs/>.

Jail Population Decline

The Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) has released *Jail Inmates at Midyear, 2012 – Statistical Tables* (NCJ 241264), which presents the number of jails and jail inmates at midyear 2012. This report describes the annual change in jail populations and patterns of change from 2000 through 2012.

PTSD

OJJDP has released "PTSD, Trauma, and Comorbid Psychiatric Disorders in Detained Youth." The bulletin is part of OJJDP's Beyond Detention series, which examines the results of the Northwestern Juvenile Project—a longitudinal study of youth detained at the Cook County Juvenile Temporary Detention Center in Chicago, IL. This bulletin presents findings on the prevalence of trauma and

posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) among juvenile detainees and PTSD's tendency to co-occur with other psychiatric disorders. Learn more about the Northwestern Juvenile Project, cosponsored by OJJDP. View and download "PTSD, Trauma, and Comorbid Psychiatric Disorders in Detained Youth."

Sexual Assault on Children

Juvenile inmates are 35 percent more likely to be sexually assaulted than the rest of the prison population. Correctional facilities in the United States have a mixed record at best in teaching youthful offenders the skills they need to thrive outside of custody. Administrators in the juvenile justice system are even less effective at keeping incarcerated juveniles safe from sexual assault. According to a new U.S. Department of Justice report, 9.5 percent of youths incarcerated in juvenile facilities in America report being sexually abused in the past year of their detention.

That's down from 12.1 percent in 2010. Still, the rate of sexual victimization in youth facilities is at least 35 percent higher than the average rate of correctional facilities across America. "These numbers are both devastating and hopeful," Lovisa Stannow, Executive Director of Just Detention International (JDI), said in a statement. "They show clearly that it is possible to protect young detainees from the devastation of sexual abuse. They also make painfully clear that many youth facilities have a very, very long way to go."

Juveniles in Residential Placement

OJJDP has released *Juveniles in Residential Placement, 2010*. The bulletin presents information from the 2010 Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement, a biennial survey of public and private juvenile residential facilities that the U.S. Census Bureau conducted and OJJDP sponsored. The bulletin compares information for detained versus committed offenders and youth in public versus private residential facilities and makes state-level comparisons. Key findings include the following: The population of juvenile offenders in custody has declined by one-third since 1997, the custody rate for black youth was more than 4.5 times the rate for white youth, and the custody rate for Hispanic youth was 1.8 times the rate for white youth. View and download "Juveniles in Residential Placement, 2010."

Youth Sexual Victimization

The Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) has released *Sexual Victimization in Juvenile Facilities Reported by Youth, 2012* (NCJ 241708), which presents data from the 2012 National Survey of Youth in Custody (NSYC), conducted in 326 juvenile confinement facilities between February and September 2012, with a sample of 8,707 adjudicated youth.

Arrest Data Analysis Tool

The dynamic Arrest Data Analysis Tool has been updated to include 2011 data, the latest year available. This also updates an incorrect version of the 2011 data available in the tool from May 31 through June 6. The tool allows you to generate graphs and tables of arrests from 1980 through the latest year.

Elder Abuse Research

Nearly 97 percent of older Americans live in domestic settings, and almost 90 percent of the reports of abuse to Adult Protective Services relate to elders who reside in a family setting, not in an institutional setting. Greater awareness of elder abuse is beginning to emerge, but studying this type of victimization has generated few theory-based explanations about the cause and how best to respond to it. In a new *Research in Brief*, authors Shelly Jackson and Thomas Hafemeister discuss findings from two NIJ studies of elder abuse in domestic settings, emphasizing the importance of developing new theories of elder abuse and of looking critically at current theories to increase our understanding and guide future research. Read "Understanding Elder Abuse: New Directions for Developing Theories of Elder Abuse Occurring in Domestic Settings."

Justice Resource Hub

The National Juvenile Justice Network (NJNN) has launched the Juvenile Justice Resource Hub, a new resource developed in partnership with Juvenile Justice Information Exchange and the MacArthur Foundation's Models for Change. The hub pulls together information and resources to provide a high-quality overview of key issues in juvenile justice, strategies for change, and resources that include research, toolkits, and links to national experts. The hub is published by the Center for Sustainable Journalism at Kennesaw State University.

Adolescent-Based Treatment Database

The National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ) has compiled information on validated, adolescent-focused treatment interventions and screening instruments. The resulting Adolescent-Based Treatment Database details intervention basics, special considerations, and strategies for engaging treatment providers, allied agencies, youth, and families.

Jail Inmates Statistical Tables

These tables can be accessed at www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/jim12st.pdf. This report describes annual change in jail populations and patterns of change from 2000 through 2012. It shows rated capacity of jails and percent of capacity occupied. The report also provides estimates of admissions to jails, details the volume of movement among the jail population, and presents the distribution of jail inmates by sex, race, and Hispanic origin. It includes information about the effect of California's public safety realignment on jail populations. The report also includes standard errors for jail estimates.

Highlights:

- After three consecutive years of decline in the jail inmate population, the number of persons confined in county and city jails (744,524) increased by 1.2% (or 8,923 inmates) between mid-year 2011 and mid-year 2012.
- Rated capacity in jails reached 886,947 beds at mid-year 2012, an increase of 0.8% (7,225 beds) from 879,722 beds in mid-year 2011.
- Local jails admitted an estimated 11.6 million persons during the 12-month period ending June 30, 2012, which was similar to 2011 (11.8 million) and down from 13.6 million in 2008.

Information Resources from NIC

The National Institute of Corrections has released a collection of new documents focused on corrections. The newest document in the Annotated Bibliography series developed by the NIC Information Center, "EBP in the Criminal Justice System," aims to explain exactly what "evidence" is and how partners

in the field can use it effectively to inform decision-making and future correctional practice. The Information Center has categorized its research into eight core principles of evidence-based practice in corrections. The list of resources is based on frequently asked questions received at the Information Center. You can download a copy at <http://nicic.gov/Library/026917>.

Criminal Justice Coordinating Committee

A criminal justice coordinating committee can help ensure the intended, effective criminal justice outcomes in a local jurisdiction. The committee plans for system-wide efforts that require the cooperation of a collection of stakeholders. Staffing the committee properly is essential to its success. The publication *Guidelines for Staffing a Local Criminal Justice Coordinating Committee*, which discusses best practices for establishing, staffing, and maintaining a committee, can be found at <http://nicic.gov/Library/026308>.

Sexual Violence Against Youth

The core of the juvenile justice system is the mission to help reform young offenders and protect them from harm while incarcerated. What to do when violence is perpetrated by staff and other youthful offenders against youth in custody is the subject of *Addressing Sexual Violence Against Youth in Custody: Youth Workers' Handbook on Identifying and Addressing Sexual Violence in Juvenile Justice Settings*. The publication addresses topics such as how to investigate allegations of abuse, what legal tools are available for prosecution, medical and mental health care for victims, and more. Copies of this publication are available online at <http://nicic.gov/Library/026309>

- FBI Arrest Statistics through 2010, including arrest rates for juveniles.
- Juvenile Court Statistics between 1985 and 2010.
- Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) on Juveniles in Court and Juveniles on Probation to 2010.

In addition, FAQs in the Juvenile Justice Structure and Process resource section have been reorganized and new FAQs have been added, including state comparisons on how probation and aftercare are administered.

Jail Deaths

The Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) has released *Mortality in Local Jails and State Prisons, 2000-2011—Statistical Tables* (NCJ 242186), which presents national and state-level data on the number of inmate deaths in local jails and state prisons, how the deaths are distributed across jails, and an aggregate count of deaths in federal prisons.

School Crime and Safety

The Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) has released "Indicators of School Crime and Safety: 2012." This report, a joint effort by BJS and the National Center for Education Statistics, provides the most current data on crime and safety at school. The report contains 21 indicators of school crime from a variety of sources, including national surveys of students, teachers, and principals. Topics include victimization at school, teacher injury, bullying and cyberbullying, school conditions, fights, weapons, drugs and alcohol, and student perceptions of personal safety at school.

Family Listening

OJJDP has released "OJJDP Family Listening Sessions: Executive Summary." In 2011, OJJDP and the Campaign for Youth Justice convened four listening sessions involving families and youth who have had direct experiences with the juvenile justice system at the local or state levels. This report summarizes the participants' experiences and their recommendations for reform. The listening sessions provide OJJDP, state juvenile justice agencies, and other stakeholders with a greater understanding of the challenges families face when their child becomes involved in the juvenile or criminal justice systems.

Youth Homicide Rates

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) has released a new report finding that homicide rates for youth ages 10–24 in the United States reached a 30-year low in 2010. The findings were seen across all age, racial, and ethnic groups and mechanisms of injury. Among the key findings:

- Declines in youth homicide rates from 2000 to 2010 were slower for groups at high risk for homicide, including males and non-Hispanic black youth.

- Declines in youth homicide rates in the same period were slower for firearm homicides than for homicides by other means.

The report focuses on the critical need for more violence prevention strategies in schools, families, and neighborhoods—particularly alternatives to violence that engage high-risk youth—and encouragement of age-appropriate activities and relationships. View CDC’s website on Youth Violence Prevention.

Vera Institute of Justice

The Vera Institute of Justice has released two new publications:

- “Measuring Success: A Guide to Becoming an Evidence-Based Practice.” This guide, funded by the MacArthur Foundation as part of its Models for Change initiative, describes the process that determines whether a program qualifies as evidence-based and explains how programs can prepare to be evaluated.
- “The Impact of Family Visitation on Incarcerated Youth’s Behavior and School Performance: Findings from the Families as Partners Project.” This brief summarizes the findings of the Families as Partners project, a partnership between the Vera Institute’s Family Justice Program and the Ohio Department of Youth Services, that looked at associations between family support and outcomes for system-involved youth during their incarceration.

Gang Membership

The National Institute of Justice and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) have published “Changing Course: Preventing Gang Membership.” Written by leading public health and criminal justice researchers, “Changing Course” provides principles to help practitioners and policymakers make decisions based on the best available evidence to prevent kids from joining a gang. The report examines why youth are attracted to gangs, explores key child development issues and risks for joining a gang, and offers prevention strategies that a variety of stakeholders—such as schools, law enforcement, public health, and communities—can use to address their specific needs. Access related resources from the National Gang Center.

Preventing Gang Membership

The National Institute of Justice and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention have released *Changing Course: Preventing Gang Membership*. Written by some of the nation’s top criminal justice and public health researchers, the book—and a separately published executive summary—helps policymakers and practitioners understand what the research says about keeping kids out of gangs. One chapter, “What Should Be Done in the Family to Prevent Gang Membership?” by Deborah Gorman-Smith, Andrea Kampfner and Kimberly Bromann Cassel, explores how strong families are a major protective factor in preventing gang-joining. For example:

- Positive family functioning—including consistent discipline—can reduce the risk of gang involvement.
- Conversely, poor family functioning increases the risk for poor outcomes, including gang affiliation.

“The best possible prevention of criminal and gang involvement begins early in life, working with parents and families to provide support, establish strong parenting practices and emotional connections, and increase parents’ connection to schools and their communities,” write Gorman-Smith and her co-authors. *Changing Course* is available in electronic, print and eBook versions.

Girls and Gangs

Despite media portrayal of gangs as overwhelmingly male, one-quarter to one-third of gang members are female. The National Institute of Justice and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention’s *Changing Course: Preventing Gang Membership* has a chapter on “How Can We Prevent Girls From Joining Gangs?” Written by Dr. Meda Chesney-Lind, it explores why girls join gangs and how strategies aimed at preventing gang-joining can address issues that are unique to girls. *Changing Course* is available in electronic, print, and eBook versions.

Life Sentences

While serious crime rates in the U.S. have been declining for the last 20 years, the number of prisoners serving life sentences has more than quadrupled since 1984. As documented in our new report, *Life Goes On: The Historic Rise in Life Sentences in America*, by senior

research analyst Ashley Nellis, over 159,000 people were serving life sentences in 2012, with nearly 50,000 serving life without parole.

Key findings from the report include:

- One of every nine individuals in prison is serving a life sentence.
- The population of prisoners serving life without parole (LWOP) has risen more sharply than those with the possibility of parole: there has been a 22.2 percent increase in LWOP since just 2008.
- Approximately 10,000 lifers have been convicted of nonviolent offenses.
- Nearly half of lifers are African American and 1 in 6 are Latino.
- More than 10,000 life-sentenced inmates have been convicted of crimes that occurred before they turned 18 and nearly 1 in 4 of them were sentenced to LWOP.
- More than 5,300 (3.4 percent) of the life-sentenced inmates are female.

In order to reshape our crime policies to facilitate rehabilitation, promote public safety, and reduce the high cost of mass incarceration, the report recommends eliminating life without parole, increasing the use of executive clemency, preparing persons sentenced to life for release from prison, and restoring the role of parole in prisoner release.

Child Abuse and Neglect

The National Academies’ Institute of Medicine and National Research Council have released “New Directions in Child Abuse and Neglect Research.” Commissioned by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services’ Administration for Children, Youth and Families, the report examines research findings on the extent, causes, and consequences of child abuse and neglect and the effectiveness of intervention programs. It also recommends establishing a coordinated national infrastructure to support future child abuse and neglect research.

What Works

CrimeSolutions.gov has just added more than a dozen evidence-based practices to its database that are based on a scientific method called “meta-analysis,” which combines multiple evaluations of similar programs to render powerful findings of what kinds of programs and practices work. A “program” is a specified set of activities providing precise guidance in

order to achieve a specific purpose. A “practice” is a general category of programs, strategies, or procedures that share similar characteristics. You will still find evidence of specific “name-brand” programs on CrimeSolutions.gov, but the new practice ratings give you additional combined evidence from across multiple programs and evaluations.

Drug Use and Health

This report and the detailed tables present a first look at results from the 2012 National Survey on Drug Use and Health (NSDUH), an annual survey of the civilian, noninstitutionalized population of the United States aged 12 years old or older. Both the report and detailed tables present national estimates of rates of use, numbers of users, and other measures related to illicit drugs, alcohol, and tobacco products, with a focus on trends between 2011 and 2012 and from 2002 to 2012, as well as differences across population subgroups in 2012. NSDUH national estimates related to mental health and NSDUH State-level estimates related to both substance use and mental health will be published in separate releases in the fall of 2013.

Health and Incarceration

Incarceration rates in the United States have risen dramatically in recent decades. The increasing numbers entering and exiting U.S. prisons and jails raise questions about the adequacy of healthcare available for them, particularly given the prevalence of drug and alcohol addictions, chronic diseases, and mental illness in the incarcerated population. Questions include the effects of incarceration itself on health, the particular vulnerabilities of people who are incarcerated, the quality and accessibility of healthcare before, during, and following incarceration, and the consequences for both the individuals and the public health in their communities when they are released. One increasingly prominent set of issues concerns capitalizing on opportunities to improve care and screening for a population with a high burden of diseases.

Health and Incarceration: A Workshop Summary provides perspective on an important set of policy issues. Undertaken in conjunction with a major study of the causes and consequences of high rates of incarceration in the United States, it is a valuable compendium of expert insights and policy

ideas for health professionals and policy makers working on these issues. This workshop was organized by the Committee on Law and Justice and the Institute of Medicine’s Board on Health of Select Populations as a way to address the charge to the Committee on the Causes and Consequences of High Rates of Incarceration funded by the National Institute of Justice and the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation.

NIJ Journal

Issue 272 of the newly redesigned *NIJ Journal* features a closer look at sexual assaults, including articles on a tool for evaluating Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner programs, lessons learned from a researcher-practitioner partnership in Los Angeles, and an in-depth look at an NIJ-sponsored project that tested 1,000 sexual assault kits (SAKs) in New Orleans. The *Journal* also includes articles about:

- Important considerations when analyzing the costs and benefits of criminal justice interventions.
- How research and development is helping to strengthen the foundations of the forensic sciences.
- A database offering information on federal and state collateral consequences of conviction.

Economics and Crime

Since 1991, violent crime rates have fallen by half, while property crime is down about 45 percent. So what’s driving the decline? John Roman, senior fellow in the Justice Policy Center at the Urban Institute, examines various measures relating the economy and crime and makes the following points on <http://blog.metrotrends.org/2013/09/americas-crime-decline-national-economy/>:

- The goal is to investigate the idea that big economic forces are not driving recent crime decline, and that the crime decline is about meso-level—not macro—forces affecting cities and their economies, but maybe in a different way than you would expect.
- It’s tempting to suggest that big macro-economic factors explain crime trends. It certainly is easy to find stories that predicted a new crime wave as the economy tanked in 2008. But it’s a difficult hypothesis to test, since crime obviously affects macroeconomic factors as well as being affected by them.

- Criminologists tend to say that *tough* economic times make more people willing to commit crimes. Bad economies lead to more property crimes and robberies as criminals steal coveted items they cannot afford. The economic anxiety of bad times leads to more domestic violence and greater consumption of mind-altering substances, leading to more violence in general.
- Economists tend to argue the opposite, that *better* economic times increase crime. More people are out and about flashing their shiny new smartphones and tablets, more new cars sit unattended in parking lots, and there are more big-screen TVs in homes to steal. Better economic times also mean more demand for drugs and alcohol, and the attendant violence that often accompanies their consumption.

Sexual Exploitation

Every day in the United States, children and adolescents are victims of commercial sexual exploitation and sex trafficking. Despite the serious and long-term consequences for victims as well as their families, communities, and society, efforts to prevent, identify, and respond to these crimes are largely under supported, inefficient, uncoordinated, and unevaluated. The Institute of Medicine (IOM) and National Research Council (NRC) studied these crimes as they affect U.S. citizens and lawful permanent residents of the United States under age 18. The IOM/NRC report offers recommendations concerning strategies for responding to commercial sexual exploitation and sex trafficking of minors in the United States, new legislative approaches, and a research agenda. The report concludes that efforts to prevent, identify, and respond to commercial sexual exploitation and sex trafficking of minors in the United States require better collaborative approaches. These efforts need to confront demand and the individuals who commit and benefit from these crimes. See <http://www.iom.edu/Reports/2013/Confronting-Commercial-Sexual-Exploitation-and-Sex-Trafficking-of-Minors-in-the-United-States.aspx#sthash.pTDm3X1i.dpuf>.

Drug War

The global war on drugs has failed, as illegal drugs have only become cheaper, more abundant, and purer in recent decades, according to a report published by a group of U.S. and Canadian researchers on Monday in the *British Medical Journal*. “The punitive prohibitionist approach to global drug control has proven remarkably costly, ineffective and counterproductive,” said Ethan Nadelmann, director of Drug Policy Alliance, following news of the report. According to the report, in the U.S. the average price of heroin, cocaine, and cannabis decreased by roughly 80 percent between 1990 and 2007. Average purity increased by 60 percent, 11 percent, and 161 percent respectively. Meanwhile, seizures of cannabis by the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration increased by 465 percent between 1990 and 2010, and heroin seizures increased by 29 percent. Cocaine seizures fell by 49 percent.

The increased seizures of these drugs has also meant a massive increase in arrests and incarceration, some for very minor charges, as groups such as Drug Policy Alliance have pointed out. According to Drug Policy Alliance, 1.53 million people were arrested in 2011 alone on nonviolent drug charges. The U.S. has spent more than \$51,000,000,000 per year on the War on Drugs.

Substance Abuse and Bipolar Disorder

A recent study published in the *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry* found that approximately one in three teens with bipolar disorder developed substance abuse, for the first time, during 4 years of follow-up. The study also identified several risk factors that predicted who among these teens was most likely to develop substance abuse. Using data from the “Course and Outcome of Bipolar Youth” (COBY) study, a group of researchers led by Dr. Benjamin Goldstein, of the University of Toronto and the University of Pittsburgh, examined 167 youth, ages 12-17 years, to document the frequency and possible predictors of first-onset substance abuse. Participants in the study were interviewed an average of 7 times over the course of 4 years in order to examine their symptoms, functioning, stressors, and treatment.

The study found that 32 percent of adolescents in COBY developed abuse or

dependence on alcohol or drugs, on average 2.7 years from the start of the study. Repeated experimentation with alcohol at the start of the study was the single strongest predictor of later substance abuse, although experimentation with cannabis also predicted later substance abuse. Five other factors present at the start of the study also predicted later substance abuse: oppositional defiant disorder, panic disorder, family history of substance abuse, low family cohesiveness, and absence of antidepressant treatment. Among teens with 3 or more risk factors, 54.7 percent went on to develop substance abuse, compared to 14.1 percent of teens with 0-2 risk factors.

Technology and School Safety

The National Law Enforcement and Corrections Technology Center, a program of the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), has published “Sharing Ideas & Resources to Keep Our Nation’s Schools Safe!” This report examines new products and apps to gauge and prevent potential school crises. The report also identifies new uses for familiar, standard-bearing technologies in school settings and highlights successful safety programs in urban and rural schools nationwide. “Indicators of School Crime and Safety: 2012,” is a joint effort by the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) and the National Center for Education Statistics that provides the most current data on crime and safety in schools and is available on the BJS website.

Predictive Policing

Despite its name, predictive policing does not actually pinpoint where and when the next crime will occur. Rather it helps identify likely targets for interventions that can prevent crime or solve past crimes. It is the application of analytical techniques that support police in their efforts to develop effective strategies to prevent crime or make investigations more effective. Through a grant from the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), the RAND Corporation has released *Predictive Policing: The Role of Crime Forecasting in Law Enforcement Operations*, a practical guide for departments interested in using predictive policing. The report assesses the most promising technical tools for making predictions and the most promising tactical approaches to act on them. By looking at data and making connections, predictive policing offers a solid prevention process to avoid and predict crimes such as gang activity and burglary.

Delinquency and Victimization

OJJDP has released “Children’s Exposure to Violence and the Intersection Between Delinquency and Victimization.” This is the fifth publication in OJJDP’s series on the National Survey of Children’s Exposure to Violence (NatSCEV), which gathered data on the incidence and prevalence of children’s exposure to violence across all ages, settings, and time frames. This bulletin presents findings about the association between delinquency and victimization among children and youth ages 10-17 in the study. The study findings have implications for practitioners in the adolescent development and intervention fields.

Violent and Property Crime Rates

The Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) has released *Criminal Victimization, 2012* (NCJ 243389). Presents 2012 estimates of rates and levels of criminal victimization in the United States, including violent victimization (rape or sexual assault, robbery, aggravated assault, and simple assault) and property victimization (burglary, motor vehicle theft, and property theft).

Victimization Analysis Tool

This dynamic analysis tool allows users to examine data from 1993 through 2012 on violent victimization (rape/sexual assault, robbery, and aggravated and simple assault), property victimization (household burglary, theft, and motor vehicle theft), and personal theft (pocket picking and completed and attempted purse snatching).

Legislative Trends

The report takes a look at states that have and are taking steps to remove children from the adult criminal justice system. Over the past eight years, 23 states have enacted 40 pieces of legislation to reduce the prosecution of youth in adult criminal courts and end the placement of youth in adult jails and prisons. The report documents the continuation of four trends in justice reform efforts across the country and highlights the key pieces of legislation enacted between 2011 and 2013:

- **Trend 1:** Eleven states (Colorado, Idaho, Indiana, Maine, Nevada, Hawaii, Virginia, Pennsylvania, Texas, Oregon, and Ohio) have passed laws limiting states’ authority to house youth in adult jails and prisons.

- **Trend 2:** Four states (Connecticut, Illinois, Mississippi, and Massachusetts) have expanded their juvenile court jurisdiction so that older youth who previously would be automatically tried as adults are not prosecuted in adult criminal court.
- **Trend 3:** Twelve states (Arizona, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Nevada, Utah, Virginia, Washington, Ohio, Maryland, and Nevada) have changed their transfer laws, making it more likely that youth will stay in the juvenile justice system.
- **Trend 4:** Eight states (California, Colorado, Georgia, Indiana, Texas, Missouri, Ohio, and Washington) have changed their mandatory minimum sentencing laws to take into account the developmental differences between youth and adults, allow for post-sentence review for youth facing juvenile life without parole or other sentencing reform for youth sentenced as adults.

See Additional Resources:
 State Trends 2013 Press Release
 State Trends Blog Post
 Report: State Trends 2011

Children Exposed to Violence

Available from OJJDP at <http://www.ojjdp.gov/pubs/240555.pdf>, the bulletin *Children's Exposure to Violence and the Intersection Between Delinquency and Victimization* presents survey results regarding the co-occurrence of victimization and delinquency among children who are exposed to violence. The survey categorized adolescents ages 10 to 17 into one of four groups: those youth who were primarily delinquents and not victims (primarily delinquents), those who were primarily victims and not delinquents (primarily victims), those who were both delinquents and victims (delinquent-victims), and those who were neither victims nor delinquents. Youth identified as delinquent-victims had higher levels of both delinquency and victimization than either the primarily victim or primarily delinquent youth. These youth also suffered more adversities, and had lower levels of social support and higher rates of mental health symptoms. The study points to the importance of early intervention. The delinquent-victim group among boys is larger

overall and increases substantially between ages 13 and 14. This may reflect an increase in delinquent activities around the time they enter high school among boys who had previously been primarily victims. The high school environment may expose them to older delinquent role models and present them with conditions of more independence and less supervision than middle school. For girls, the pattern change appears to occur earlier (between ages 11 and 12) and is associated with an increase in both victimization and delinquency, but particularly victimization. This is likely related to the onset of puberty in girls and shows up in the data as a particularly marked increase in sexual harassment. These findings strongly suggest that delinquency- and victimization-prevention efforts need to be marshaled around or before the fifth grade, and they need to include components that minimize sexual aggression and harassment. To order print copies of *Children's Exposure to Violence and the Intersection Between Delinquency and Victimization*, visit the New Publications page.

YOUR BOOKSHELF ON REVIEW

A Prison Officer's Perspective

Sweet Hell on Fire: A Memoir of the Prison I Worked in and the Prison I Lived In

by Sara Lunsford

Sourcebooks, 2012, 266 pp., \$14.99.

REVIEWED BY JOEL GOODMAN

Frequently misunderstood is the important distinction between the terms “prison officer” and “prison guard.” Sara Lunsford, a former prison officer for the Kansas Department of Corrections, has the credentials to illustrate the difference between the contradictory attitudes that define the two. She writes that a prison officer:

does his job and gives them [prisoners] what they have coming and nothing else. Officers are fair, firm, and consistent. Officers are professionals who do their jobs and put their lives on the line every day.

A prison guard:

is sloppy, lazy, inconsistent, illiterate, easily bought—a finger-up-the-nose-to-the-first-knuckle waste of space.

Lunsford's passionate book is, as the subtitle indicates, a memoir rather than a descriptive or analytical look at the workings of a prison system. The author shows the good and bad of contemporary prisons with a blunt though balanced style. Like many in the prison business, she is second generation—her father was employed by the Bureau of Prisons. That background knowledge likely softened the monumental culture shock that most of us experience when starting a prison officer career. Even with that insight, she describes an acculturation process that to her mind left a permanent mark:

“...I know the details of what we do are often kept quiet. That's just part of the culture of The Job.”

“They say that during the first year of corrections, an officer is no good for The

Job. After that year, they're no good for anything else.”

“I see people differently now that I did before The Job. Still can't sit with my back to a door or eat or drink anything that's been left unattended. I look for the ulterior motive in every gesture and every kindness. I still automatically detach from most people, disengage lest I see too much of what's below the surface...”

Unlike most in this profession, Lunsford is a revealing storyteller. She describes the writing of this book in her preface: “So I got out my scalpel/keyboard and flayed myself open and spilled everything all over the page.” An illustration of her frank insight is this excerpt from page 200:

No one ever dreams they'll grow up to be a boozed-out, bar-whore corrections officer with no future and no dreams either. And that's exactly what I was...

This was all my own doing. Yes, the world was in fact a horrible place, but I was making it worse all on my own.

Her candor is refreshing and those of us in the profession should be alarmed by the dysfunctional conditions that she describes about her state prison's operations. These problems are not unique to Kansas—an examination of any state, federal, or privately-operated prison will reveal the same troubling situations that Lunsford pulls no punches to describe:

- Violence
- Low officer pay
- Hostage situations
- Gangs
- Officer corruption
- Sexual relationships between prison staff and inmates
- Contraband

Prison dysfunction has ramifications throughout the criminal justice system. A product of this harsh prison environment will carry his or her prison experience back to the

community, which adds a layer of complexity to community supervision and challenges for law enforcement.

Lunsford's sage advice is valuable. When discussing officer standard of care for inmates, she notes that her uniform says Department of Corrections, not Concierge. She frequently illustrates the importance of treating all inmates fairly and consistently. Her authorizing an inmate a call to his ailing mother and the resulting unintended consequences illustrate the importance of balancing compassion with rule enforcement.

Lunsford does not mince words describing the horrific problems resulting from corrupt staff. For example, she describes a prison guard having a relationship with an inmate convicted of multiple counts of child molestation and kidnapping:

Not only because we'd ejected her from our world, but having a relationship with someone in your care like that is a sex crime. Of course, then there's the part where she had gotten him a lawyer and was trying to get his sentence reduced and wanted him to come live with her and her children. If she'd wantonly and actively seek to bring that into her home, what else had her poor children been exposed to?

Underrepresented in literature is the perspective of prison officers. Sara Lunsford bridges that gap. Her candor about working on the dark side of the criminal justice profession is realistic and her message important.

Lunsford is a talented writer and honorable professional who served with distinction as a state prison officer. Her personal revelations and journey to gain peace are instructive. Her story will inspire those with similar challenges.

Lunsford writing style captivates and she provides an honest look at the reality of working in a penal institution. Her book has value for college classes and prison introductory training courses. It is a must-read for anyone contemplating a career in this challenging profession.

CONTRIBUTORS

To This Issue

Eileen M. Ahlin

Assistant Professor of Criminal Justice in the School of Public Affairs, Penn State Harrisburg. Previously, Senior Study Director, Westat. Ph.D., University of Maryland, College Park. Author of "Locus of Control Redux: Adolescents' Choice to Refrain from Violence," *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* (in press).

Maria João Lobo Antunes

Adjunct Professor, Towson University, Maryland. Previously, Research Associate, Westat. Ph.D., University of Maryland, College Park. Co-author of "Family Management and Youth Violence: Are Parents or Community More Salient?" *Journal of Community Psychology* (in press).

James M. Byrne

Director, Global Centre for Evidence-based Corrections and Sentencing; Professor, School of Criminology and Criminal Justice, Griffith University, Australia; and Professor, School of Criminology and Justice Studies, University of Massachusetts, Lowell. Editor-in-Chief, *Victims and Offenders: An International Journal of Evidence-based Research, Policy, and Practice*. Ph.D., Rutgers University.

Michael Hall

Supervising Probation Officer, San Diego County Probation. Master's in Public Administration, National University.

Mack Jenkins

Chief Probation Officer, San Diego County Probation. Masters in Criminal Justice, California State University at Long Beach.

Ryan M. Labrecque

Research Assistant and doctoral candidate, University of Cincinnati. M.S., University of Cincinnati. Co-author of "Development and Implementation of a Case Review Conference Model for Juveniles: A Structured Approach to Learning from Unsuccessful Probationers," *Federal Probation* (Dec. 2012).

Karyn Milligan

Administrative Analyst, San Diego County Probation. Master's in Public Administration, San Diego State University.

Natalie Pearl

Director of Research, San Diego County Probation. Ph.D. in Public Policy, Brandeis University.

Sudipto Roy

Professor, Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice, Indiana State University, Terre Haute, IN. Ph.D., Western Michigan University. Co-author of "The Effects of Prison Security Level on Job Satisfaction and Job Burnout Among Prison Staff in the USA: An Assessment," *International Journal of Criminal Justice Services*, 7(2) (2012).

Myrinda Schweitzer

Deputy Director, Senior Research Associate, and doctoral candidate, University of Cincinnati. M.A., John Jay College of Criminal Justice, New York. Co-author of "Improving Probation Officers' Supervision Skills: An Evaluation of the EPICS Model," *Journal of Crime and Justice* (2012).

Paula Smith

Associate Professor, University of Cincinnati. Ph.D., University of New Brunswick, Saint John, Canada. Co-author of *Corrections in the Community* (5th ed., 2012).

Cara Thompson

Research Associate and doctoral candidate, University of Cincinnati. ABD, University of Cincinnati.

Heather Tubman-Carbone

Research Associate, Westat. Masters, London School of Economics and Political Science. Research Associate, Westat.

BOOK REVIEWER

Joel G. Goodman

Litigation consultant, Centennial, CO. Retired prison officer, Bureau of Prisons.

Index of Articles

Volume 77, January to December 2013

Criminal Justice System

A Review of Probation Home Visits: What Do We Know? Eileen M. Ahlin, Maria João Lobo Antunes, Heather Tubman-Carbone, No. 3.....	32
After the Fall: Assessing the Impact of the Great Prison Experiment on Future Crime Control Policy James M. Byrne, No. 3.....	3
Capitalizing on Collaboration in Arizona: Working Together to Advance the Use of Evidence-Based Officer Skills at All Levels of Community Corrections Kathy Waters, Mario Moreno, R. Brian Colgan, No. 2.....	59
Coaching: The True Path to Proficiency, From an Officer's Perspective Melissa Alexander, Lisa Palombo, Ed Cameron, Evey Wooten, Matthew White, Michael Casey, Christopher Bersch, No. 2.....	64
Community Management of Offenders: The Interaction of Social Support and Risk Anna Macklin, No. 1.....	17
Creating a Supervision Tool Kit: How to Improve Probation and Parole Lily Gleicher, Sarah M. Manchak, Francis T. Cullen, No. 1.....	22
Early Termination of Supervision: No Compromise to Community Safety Laura M. Baber, James L. Johnson, No. 2.....	17
<i>From the Archives</i> (Federal Probation <i>May-June 1937</i>): Is There a Measure of Probation Success? Bennet Mead, No. 3.....	38
Overcoming Legal Barriers to Reentry: A Law School-Based Approach to Providing Legal Services to the Reentry Community Todd A. Berger, Joseph A. DaGrossa, No. 1.....	3
Policy Implications of Police-Probation/Parole Partnerships: A Review of the Empirical Literature Adam K. Matz, Bitna Kim, No. 1.....	9
Targeting Antisocial Attitudes in Community Supervision Using the EPICS Model: An Examination of Change Scores on the Criminal Sentiment Scale Ryan Labrecque, Karyn Milligan, Michael Hall, Mack Jenkins, No. 3.....	15
The Trials and Tribulations of Implementing <i>What Works</i> : Training Rarely Trumps Values Mario A. Paparozzi, Roger Guy, No. 2.....	36
Too Many Going Back, Not Enough Getting Out? Supervision Violators, Probation Supervision, and Overcrowding in the Federal Bureau of Prisons Matthew G. Rowland, No. 2.....	3

Officer Health

Officer Stress Linked to CVD: What We Know James M. Vicini Jr., No. 1.....	33
---	----

Parole

- Creating a Supervision Tool Kit: How to Improve Probation and Parole
Lily Gleicher, Sarah M. Manchak, Francis T. Cullen, No. 1..... 22

- Policy Implications of Police-Probation/Parole Partnerships: A Review of the Empirical Literature
Adam K. Matz, Bitna Kim, No. 1..... 9

Pretrial Services

- Using Research to Improve Pretrial Justice and Public Safety: Results from PSA's Risk Assessment Validation Project
Spurgeon Kennedy, Laura House, Michael Williams, No. 1..... 28

Prisons

- After the Fall: Assessing the Impact of the Great Prison Experiment on Future Crime Control Policy
James M. Byrne, No. 3..... 3

- Too Many Going Back, Not Enough Getting Out? Supervision Violators, Probation Supervision,
and Overcrowding in the Federal Bureau of Prisons
Matthew G. Rowland, No. 2..... 3

Prisoner Reentry

- After the Fall: Assessing the Impact of the Great Prison Experiment on Future Crime Control Policy
James M. Byrne, No. 3..... 3

- Community Management of Offenders: The Interaction of Social Support and Risk
Anna Macklin, No. 1..... 17

- Creating a Supervision Tool Kit: How to Improve Probation and Parole
Lily Gleicher, Sarah M. Manchak, Francis T. Cullen, No. 1..... 22

- Early Termination of Supervision: No Compromise to Community Safety
Laura M. Baber, James L. Johnson, No. 2..... 17

- Exit Status of Probationers and Prison-Bound Offenders in an Electronic Monitoring Home Detention Program: A Comparative Study
Sudipto Roy, No. 3..... 26

- Overcoming Legal Barriers to Reentry: A Law School-Based Approach to Providing Legal Services to the Reentry Community
Todd A. Berger, Joseph A. DaGrossa, No. 1..... 3

- Reducing Recidivism Through Probation Supervision: What We Know and Don't Know From Four Decades of Research
Chris Trotter, No. 2..... 43

- Targeting Antisocial Attitudes in Community Supervision Using the EPICS Model:
An Examination of Change Scores on the Criminal Sentiment Scale
Ryan Labrecque, Karyn Milligan, Michael Hall, Mack Jenkins, No. 3..... 15

- Use of Engagement Skills in Community Corrections for High-Risk Offenders
Natalie Pearl, Karyn Milligan, Michael Hall, Mack Jenkins, No. 3..... 21

Probation

- A Review of Probation Home Visits: What Do We Know?
Eileen M. Ahlin, Maria João Lobo Antunes, Heather Tubman-Carbone, No. 3..... 32

- Capitalizing on Collaboration in Arizona: Working Together to Advance the Use of Evidence-Based
Officer Skills at All Levels of Community Corrections
Kathy Waters, Mario Moreno, R. Brian Colgan, No. 2..... 59

- Coaching: The True Path to Proficiency, From an Officer's Perspective
Melissa Alexander, Lisa Palombo, Ed Cameron, Evey Wooten, Matthew White, Michael Casey, Christopher Bersch, No. 2..... 64

- Community Management of Offenders: The Interaction of Social Support and Risk
Anna Macklin, No. 1..... 17

Creating a Supervision Tool Kit: How to Improve Probation and Parole Lily Gleicher, Sarah M. Manchak, Francis T. Cullen, No. 1.....	22
Early Termination of Supervision: No Compromise to Community Safety Laura M. Baber, James L. Johnson, No. 2.....	17
Exit Status of Probationers and Prison-Bound Offenders in an Electronic Monitoring Home Detention Program: A Comparative Study Sudipto Roy, No. 3.....	26
Extending Our Knowledge About Recidivism of Persons on Federal Supervision Laura M. Baber, Mark Motivans, No. 2.....	23
Overcoming Legal Barriers to Reentry: A Law School-Based Approach to Providing Legal Services to the Reentry Community Todd A. Berger, Joseph A. DaGrossa, No. 1.....	3
Policy Implications of Police-Probation/Parole Partnerships: A Review of the Empirical Literature Adam K. Matz, Bitna Kim, No. 1.....	9
Reducing Recidivism Through Probation Supervision: What We Know and Don't Know From Four Decades of Research Chris Trotter, No. 2.....	43
7 Keys to "Make EBPs Stick": Lessons From the Field Faye S. Taxman, No. 2.....	76
Skills and Training in British Probation: A Tale of Neglect and Possible Revival Peter Raynor, Pamela Ugwudike, No. 2.....	49
Targeting Antisocial Attitudes in Community Supervision Using the EPICS Model: An Examination of Change Scores on the Criminal Sentiment Scale Ryan Labrecque, Karyn Milligan, Michael Hall, Mack Jenkins, No. 3.....	15
The Demands on Probation Officers in the Evolution of Evidence-Based Practice: The Forgotten Foot Soldier of Community Corrections Guy Bourgon, No. 2.....	30
Too Many Going Back, Not Enough Getting Out? Supervision Violators, Probation Supervision, and Overcrowding in the Federal Bureau of Prisons Matthew G. Rowland, No. 2.....	3
Use of Engagement Skills in Community Corrections for High-Risk Offenders Natalie Pearl, Karyn Milligan, Michael Hall, Mack Jenkins, No. 3.....	21
Using Quality Improvement Models in Correctional Organizations Danielle S. Rudes, Jill Viglione, Courtney Porter, No. 2.....	69
Program Evaluation	
Early Termination of Supervision: No Compromise to Community Safety Laura M. Baber, James L. Johnson, No. 2.....	17
Reducing Recidivism Through Probation Supervision: What We Know and Don't Know From Four Decades of Research Chris Trotter, No. 2.....	43
7 Keys to "Make EBPs Stick": Lessons From the Field Faye S. Taxman, No. 2.....	76
Skills and Training in British Probation: A Tale of Neglect and Possible Revival Peter Raynor, Pamela Ugwudike, No. 2.....	49
Targeting Antisocial Attitudes in Community Supervision Using the EPICS Model: An Examination of Change Scores on the Criminal Sentiment Scale Ryan Labrecque, Karyn Milligan, Michael Hall, Mack Jenkins, No. 3.....	15

Use of Engagement Skills in Community Corrections for High-Risk Offenders Natalie Pearl, Karyn Milligan, Michael Hall, Mack Jenkins, No. 3	21
Using Quality Improvement Models in Correctional Organizations Danielle S. Rudes, Jill Viglione, Courtney Porter, No. 2	69
Recidivism	
After the Fall: Assessing the Impact of the Great Prison Experiment on Future Crime Control Policy James M. Byrne, No. 3	3
Exit Status of Probationers and Prison-Bound Offenders in an Electronic Monitoring Home Detention Program: A Comparative Study Sudipto Roy, No. 3	26
Extending Our Knowledge About Recidivism of Persons on Federal Supervision Laura M. Baber, Mark Motivans, No. 2	23
Too Many Going Back, Not Enough Getting Out? Supervision Violators, Probation Supervision, and Overcrowding in the Federal Bureau of Prisons Matthew G. Rowland, No. 2	3
Risk Assessment	
Using Research to Improve Pretrial Justice and Public Safety: Results from PSA's Risk Assessment Validation Project Spurgeon Kennedy, Laura House, Michael Williams, No. 1	28
Training	
Capitalizing on Collaboration in Arizona: Working Together to Advance the Use of Evidence-Based Officer Skills at All Levels of Community Corrections Kathy Waters, Mario Moreno, R. Brian Colgan, No. 2	59
Changing Probation Officer Attitudes: Training Experience, Motivation, and Knowledge Christopher T. Lowenkamp, Alexander M. Holsinger, Anthony W. Flores, Igor Koutsenok, Natalie Pearl, No. 2	54
Coaching: The True Path to Proficiency, From an Officer's Perspective Melissa Alexander, Lisa Palombo, Ed Cameron, Evey Wooten, Matthew White, Michael Casey, Christopher Bersch, No. 2	64
7 Keys to "Make EBPs Stick": Lessons From the Field Faye S. Taxman, No. 2	76
Skills and Training in British Probation: A Tale of Neglect and Possible Revival Peter Raynor, Pamela Ugwudike, No. 2	49
Targeting Antisocial Attitudes in Community Supervision Using the EPICS Model: An Examination of Change Scores on the Criminal Sentiment Scale Ryan Labrecque, Karyn Milligan, Michael Hall, Mack Jenkins, No. 3	15
The Demands on Probation Officers in the Evolution of Evidence-Based Practice: The Forgotten Foot Soldier of Community Corrections Guy Bourgon, No. 2	30
The Trials and Tribulations of Implementing <i>What Works</i> : Training Rarely Trumps Values Mario A. Paparozzi, Roger Guy, No. 2	36
Use of Engagement Skills in Community Corrections for High-Risk Offenders Natalie Pearl, Karyn Milligan, Michael Hall, Mack Jenkins, No. 3	21
Index of Book Reviews Volume 77, January to December 2013	
<i>Sweet Hell on Fire: a memoir of the prison I worked in and the prison I lived in</i> Reviewed by Joel Goodman, No. 3	50

United States Government

INFORMATION

Order Processing Code

***5876**

ORDER ONLINE FROM
<http://bookstore.gpo.gov>

FAX YOUR ORDER TO
202-512-2104

PHONE YOUR ORDER TO
202-512-1800 or
866-512-1800

MAIL YOUR ORDER TO
Superintendent of Documents
P.O. Box 979050
St. Louis, MO 63197-9000

IMPORTANT!
Please include your completed
order form with your remittance

*thank you for
your order!*

Federal PROBATION

*a journal of correctional
philosophy and practice*

Please send me _____ subscription(s) to *Federal Probation* at \$16.50 each (\$22.40 foreign) per year. The total cost of my order is \$_____.

Price includes shipping and handling and is subject to change.

(PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT) NAME OR TITLE

COMPANY NAME ROOM, FLOOR, OR SUITE

STREET ADDRESS

CITY STATE ZIP CODE + 4

DAYTIME PHONE INCLUDING AREA CODE

PURCHASE ORDER NUMBER (OPTIONAL)

Method of Payment

Check payable to: Superintendent of Documents

GPO Deposit Account _____

Credit Card Visa Master Card Discover

CARD NUMBER EXPIRATION DATE

AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE



FEDERAL PROBATION

Administrative Office
of the United States Courts

Washington, DC 20544