What Works and What Doesn’t in Reducing Recidivism: The Principles of Effective Intervention:

Presented by:
Edward J. Latessa, Ph.D.
Center for Criminal Justice Research
Division of Criminal Justice
University of Cincinnati
www.uc.edu/criminaljustice
Evidence Based – What does it mean?

There are different forms of evidence:

– The lowest form is anecdotal evidence, but it makes us feel good

– The highest form is empirical evidence – results from controlled studies, but it doesn’t make us feel good
TERMS:

• Evidence: Refers to results from controlled studies, involving distinguishing between experimental groups and control or comparison groups.

• Risk: Refers to risk of reoffending. Recidivism rates are compared over a standard and specified follow-up period.
What does the Research tell us?

*There is often a Misapplication of Research: “XXX Study Says”*

- *the problem is if you believe every study we wouldn’t eat anything (but we would drink a lot of red wine!)*

- Looking at one study can be a mistake

- Need to examine a body of research

- So, what does the body of knowledge about correctional interventions tell us?
FROM THE EARLIEST REVIEWS:

• Not a single reviewer of studies of the effects of official punishment (custody, mandatory arrests, increased surveillance, etc.) has found consistent evidence of reduced recidivism.

• At least 40% and up to 60% of the studies of correctional treatment services reported reduced recidivism rates relative to various comparison conditions, in every published review.
Criminal Sanctions versus Treatment

Mean Phi

Reduced Recidivism

Increased Recidivism

CS -.07 (Number of Studies=30)

Treatment .15 (Number of Studies=124)
People Who Appear to be Resistant to Punishment

- Psychopathic risk takers
- Those under the influence of a substance
- Those with a history of being punished
Most researchers who study correctional interventions have concluded:

- Without some form of human intervention or services there is unlikely to be much effect on recidivism from punishment alone.

- The evidence also indicates that while treatment is more effective in reducing recidivism than punishment – Not all treatment programs are equally effective.
Behavioral vs. NonBehavioral

Meta-Analysis of Treatment for Females
by Dowden and Andrews

Community Based versus Institutional Programs: Results from Meta-Analyses of Programs Based on Principles of Effective Treatment

Another important body of knowledge to understand is the research on risk factors. What are the risk factors correlated with criminal conduct?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Mean r</th>
<th># of studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower class origins</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal distress/psychopathology</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational/Vocational achievement</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental/Family Factors</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperament/misconduct/personality</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisocial attitudes/associates</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mentally Disordered Offenders (MDOs)

Conventional Clinical Wisdom:

- Criminal activities of MDOs best explained by psychopathological models

- Assessments typically focus on psychiatric diagnoses, psychiatric symptomatology, and personal distress (i.e. anxiety, depression)

- Assessments are often costly and time consuming
MDOs Continued

Review of the Empirical Research:

• The Psychopathological model has little relevance regarding the prediction of MDO criminal behavior

• Gendreau conducted meta-analysis on studies of psychiatric symptomatology and general recidivism: Correlation=ZERO

• Bonta’s meta analysis found correlation between having a diagnosed mental disorder, mood disorder, or psychosis and general/violent recidivism ranged from \( r = .01 \) to \( -.17 \).

• Criminogenic risk factors were the strongest predictors \( (r=.23) \)
### Meta-Analysis of Risk Factors by Simourd

Mean Adjusted $r$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Factor</th>
<th>Adjusted $R$</th>
<th>#Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower social class</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal distress/psychopathy</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family structure/parental problems</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor personality variables</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor parent-child relations</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal educational/vocational achievement</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperament/misconduct/self control</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisocial attitudes/associates</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Correlates of Criminal Conduct and Gender by Simourd and Andrews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower class origins</td>
<td>.04(58)</td>
<td>.03(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal distress/psychopathology</td>
<td>.09(157)</td>
<td>.08(19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal education/vocational achievement</td>
<td>.11(96)</td>
<td>.13(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental/family factors</td>
<td>.16(180)</td>
<td>.16(43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperament/misconduct/personality</td>
<td>.18(461)</td>
<td>.23(38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisocial attitudes/associates</td>
<td>.21(113)</td>
<td>.23(12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Factor</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower social class</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Distress/psychopathy</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family structure/parental problems</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor personality variables</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor parent-child relations</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal educational/vocational achievement</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperament or misconduct problems</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisocial attitudes/peers</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Identified Needs of Male & Female Maximum Security Offenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Need</th>
<th>Male (n=54)</th>
<th>Female (n=37)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>90.7%</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital/Family*</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associates</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Functioning</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal/Emotional</td>
<td>96.3%</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: *p*<.05*  
• Research by Andrews, Gendreau and others has led to the identification of some major risk/need factors
Major Set of Risk/Need Factors

1. Antisocial/prociminal attitudes, values, beliefs and cognitive-emotional states
Identifying Procriminal Attitudes, Values & Beliefs

Procriminal sentiments are what people think, not how people think; they comprise the content of thought, not the skills of thinking.

What to listen for:

- Negative expression about the law
- Negative expression about conventional institutions, values, rules, & procedures; including authority
- Negative expressions about self-management of behavior; including problem solving ability
- Negative attitudes toward self and one’s ability to achieve through conventional means
- Lack of empathy and sensitivity toward others
Neutralization & Minimizations

Offenders often neutralize their behavior. Neutralizations are a set of verbalizations which function to say that in particular situations, it is “OK” to violate the law.

**Neutralization Techniques include:**

- **Denial of Responsibility:** Criminal acts are due to factors beyond the control of the individual, thus, the individual is guilt free to act.

- **Denial of Injury:** Admits responsibility for the act, but minimizes the extent of harm or denies any harm.

- **Denial of the Victim:** Reverses the role of offender & victim & blames the victim.

- **“System Bashing”**: Those who disapprove of the offender’s acts are defined as immoral, hypocritical, or criminal themselves.

- **Appeal to Higher Loyalties:** “Live by a different code” – the demands of larger society are sacrificed for the demands of more immediate loyalties.
Major set Risk/needs continued:

2. Procriminal associates and isolation from anticriminal others
Reducing Negative Peer Associations

✓ Teach offender to recognize & avoid negative influences (people, places, things)
✓ Practice new skills (like being assertive instead of passive)
✓ Teach how to maintain relationships w/o getting into trouble
✓ Identify or develop positive associations: mentors, family, friends, teachers, employer, etc.
✓ Train family and friends to assist offender
✓ Set and enforce curfews
✓ Ban hangouts, etc.
✓ Set goal of one new friend (positive association) per month
✓ Develop sober leisure activities
3. Temperamental and personality factors conducive to criminal activity including:
   – Psychopathy
   – Weak Socialization
   – Impulsivity
   – Restless Aggressive Energy
   – Egocentrism
   – Below Average Verbal intelligence
   – A Taste For Risk
   – Weak Problem-Solving/Self-Regulation Skills
Psychopathy Checklist (Hare Psychopathy)

- Glib/superficial charm
- Grandiose sense of self
- Stimulation seeking
- Pathological lying
- Conning/manipulation
- Lack of remorse/guilt
- Shallow affect
- Callousness/lack empathy
- Parasitic lifestyle
- Poor behavioral control
- Promiscuous sexual behavior
- Early behavioral problems
- Lack of realistic goals
- Impulsivity
- Irresponsibility
- Not accepting responsibility
- Many marital relationships
- Juvenile delinquency
- Conditional release revoked
- Criminal versatility
Major set of Risk/Need factors continued:

4. A history of antisocial behavior:
   - Evident from a young age
   - In a variety of settings
   - Involving a number and variety of different acts
Lifecourse studies indicate that:

• By age 12, up to 40% of later serious offenders have committed their first criminal act

• By age 14, up to 85% have committed their first criminal act

• Variety of settings including home, school, streets

• Escalating behavior
Major set of Risk/Needs Continued:

5. Family factors that include criminality and a variety of psychological problems in the family of origin including:

- Low levels of affection, caring and cohesiveness
- Poor parental supervision and discipline practices
- Out right neglect and abuse
Major set of Risk/Needs continued:

6. Low levels of personal educational, vocational or financial achievement
NATIONAL STUDY OF NCAA DIVISION I FOOTBALL AND BASKETBALL PLAYERS BY CULLEN & LATESSA FOUND:

Infractions were higher among student-athletes:

- Who were highly recruited
- Who associated with fellow athletes that broke rules or saw nothing wrong with cheating
- Who personally embraced values defining rule violations as acceptable
- Who did not have close relationships with their parents or coaches
- Who reported prior delinquent behavior

RECENT STUDY OF NCAA DIVISION I FOOTBALL AND BASKETBALL PLAYERS FOUND

Violations were unrelated to:

- **ECONOMIC DEPRIVATION**: coming from an impoverished background and having a lack of money while in college do not appear to be major sources of rule infractions.

- **ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT**: how strongly winning was emphasized, success or failure of the program, league, region of the country, etc. were not factors.

- **THREATS OF SANCTIONS**: certainty and severity of punishment for violating rules were not related to infractions.

Recent study of parole violators in Pennsylvania found three major factors related to failure*

- Unrealistic expectations about life outside of prison
- Maintained anti social attitudes, values and beliefs that support offending or violating behavior
- Inadequate coping and problem solving skills especially when faced with emotional uneasiness or daily life problems

*Conducted by Pennsylvania Dept. of Corrections
## Major Risk and/or Need Factor and Promising Intermediate Targets for Reduced Recidivism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Dynamic Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History of Antisocial Behavior</td>
<td>Early &amp; continued involvement in a number antisocial acts</td>
<td>Build noncriminal alternative behaviors in risky situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisocial personality</td>
<td>Adventurous, pleasure seeking, weak self control, restlessly aggressive</td>
<td>Build problem-solving, self-management, anger management, &amp; coping skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisocial cognition</td>
<td>Attitudes, values, beliefs &amp; rationalizations supportive of crime, cognitive emotional states of anger, resentment, &amp; defiance</td>
<td>Reduce antisocial cognition, recognize risky thinking &amp; feelings, build up alternative less risky thinking &amp; feelings Adopt a reform and/or anticriminal identity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Major Risk and/or Need Factor and Promising Intermediate Targets for Reduced Recidivism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Dynamic Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antisocial associates</td>
<td>Close association with criminals &amp; relative isolation from prosocial people</td>
<td>Reduce association with criminals, enhance association with prosocial people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and/or marital</td>
<td>Two key elements are nurturance and/or caring &amp; monitoring and/or supervision</td>
<td>Reduce conflict, build positive relationships, better communication, enhance monitoring &amp; supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School and/or work</td>
<td>Low levels of performance &amp; satisfaction</td>
<td>Enhance performance, rewards, &amp; satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
<td>Abuse of alcohol and/or drugs</td>
<td>Reduce SA, reduce the personal &amp; interpersonal supports for SA behavior, enhance alternatives to SA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This research has led to the identification of some principles
Principles of Effective Intervention

• Risk Principle – target higher risk offenders (WHO)

• Need Principle – target criminogenic risk/need factors (WHAT)

• Treatment Principle – use behavioral approaches (HOW)

• Fidelity Principle – implement program as designed (HOW WELL)
Risk Principle

• Target those offender with higher probability of recidivism

• Provide most intensive treatment to higher risk offenders

• Intensive treatment for lower risk offender can increase recidivism
The Risk Principle & Correctional Intervention Results from Meta Analysis

Dowden & Andrews, 1999
Recent Study of Intensive Rehabilitation Supervision in Canada

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Non-Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Risk</strong></td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Risk</strong></td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECENT STUDY OF COMMUNITY CORRECTIONAL PROGRAMS IN OHIO

• Largest study of community based correctional treatment facilities ever done

• Total of 13,221 offenders – 37 Halfway Houses and 15 Community Based Correctional Facilities (CBCFs) were included in the study.

• Two-year follow-up conducted on all offenders

• Recidivism measures included new arrests & incarceration in a state penal institution

• We also examined program characteristics
Experimental Groups:
• 3,737 offenders released from prison in FY 99 and placed in one of 37 Halfway Houses in Ohio
• 3,629 offenders direct sentenced to one of 15 CBCFs

Control Group:
• 5,855 offenders released from prison onto parole supervision during the same time period
• Offenders were matched based on offense level & county of sentence
Determination of Risk

• Each offender was given a risk score based on 14 items that predicted outcome.

• This allowed us to compare low risk offenders who were placed in a program to low risk offenders that were not, high risk to high risk, and so forth.
Treatment Effects For High Risk Offenders
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# Need Principle

By assessing and targeting criminogenic needs for change, agencies can reduce the probability of recidivism.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criminogenic</th>
<th>Non-Criminogenic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Anti social attitudes</td>
<td>• Anxiety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Anti social friends</td>
<td>• Low self esteem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Substance abuse</td>
<td>• Creative abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of empathy</td>
<td>• Medical needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Impulsive behavior</td>
<td>• Physical conditioning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Targeting Criminogenic Need: Results from Meta-Analyses

Reduction in Recidivism

Increase in Recidivism

Target 1-3 more non-criminogenic needs

Target at least 4-6 more criminogenic needs

Treatment Principle

The most effective interventions are behavioral:

• Focus on current factors that influence behavior

• Action oriented

• Offender behavior is appropriately reinforced
Relationship between Treatment Model and Treatment Effect for Residential Programs

% Change in Recidivism

Cognitive Behavioral

Other
Why practice? Relationship between Treatment Activities and Treatment Effect for Residential Programs
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Effective programs have certain characteristics:

- Are based on research & sound theory
- Have leadership
- Assess offenders using risk & need assessment instruments
- Target crime producing behaviors
- Use effective treatment models
- Vary treatment & services based on risk, needs, & responsivity factors
- Disrupt criminal networks
- Have qualified, experienced, dedicated & educated staff
- Provide aftercare
- Evaluate what they do
- Are stable & have sufficient resources & support
Many correctional intervention programs are based on tradition, custom, & imitation rather than scientific evidence of effectiveness.
The Christopher Columbus Style of Program Design

WHEN HE SET OUT...

He didn’t know where he was going.

WHEN HE GOT THERE...

He didn’t know where he was.

WHEN HE GOT BACK...

He didn’t know where he had been.
Some so called “theories” we have come across

• “Been there done that theory”

• “Offenders lack creativity theory”

• “Offenders need to get back to nature theory”

• “Offenders lack discipline theory”

• “Offenders lack organizational skills theory”

• “Offenders have low self-esteem theory”

• “Offenders need to change their diet theory”

• “Treat them as babies & dress them in diapers theory”

• “We just want them to be happy theory”

• “Offenders (females) need to learn to put on makeup & dress better theory”

• “Male offenders need to get in touch with their feminine side theory”
Effective Programs are Based on Theory and Research

- Program development includes extensive literature review

- There is theoretical foundation to the program and its components

- The interventions are linked to criminogenic needs

- The staff understands the interventions, why they are being used, and how to apply them
Assessment is the engine that drives effective correctional programs
Why is it Important?

• Helps you meet the risk principle:
  – Tells you who needs the most intervention
  – Helps prevent iatrogenic effects

• Helps you meet the need principle
  – Tells you what criminogenic needs to target

• Helps guide decision making

• Helps reduces bias

• Improves placement of offenders

• Helps better utilize resources

• Helps you know if offender has improved

• Can lead to enhanced PUBLIC SAFETY
Classification & Assessment of Offenders

• Primary measures have been identified

• Best predictors of criminal behavior:
  Static factors – past criminal behavior
  Dynamic factors – crime producing needs

• Best assessment method is the actuarial (statistical) approach

• Best practices allow for risk management and risk reduction through effective treatment

• Latest generation of instruments allow for measurement of change in offender
According to the American Heart Association, there are a number of risk factors that increase your chances of a first heart attack:

- Family history of heart attacks
- Gender (males)
- Age (over 50)
- Inactive lifestyle
- Over weight
- High blood pressure
- Smoking
- High Cholesterol level
Comparison of Clinical vs. Statistical Prediction of Recidivism

Statewide LSI-R Adult Offender Data for Community Corrections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Discharge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Wide (19,344)</td>
<td>19.44</td>
<td>14.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential/WR (4,728)</td>
<td>18.76</td>
<td>15.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Reporting (2,056)</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Detention (6,909)</td>
<td>18.15</td>
<td>14.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Effective programs assess offenders:

- Program has screening criteria
- Offenders are assessed on all major risk, need & responsivity factors
- Assessment process is objective and standardized
- Levels of risk, need & responsivity are determined by assessment process
- Instruments are normed and validated
Responsivity refers to learning style and characteristics of the offender, which can effect their engagement in treatment
Responsivity areas to assess can include:

- Motivation to change
- Anxiety/psychopathy
- Levels of psychological development
- Maturity
- Cognitive functioning
- Mental disorders
Some Common Problems with Offender Assessment

- Assess offenders but process ignores important factors
- Assess offenders but don’t distinguish levels (high, moderate, low)
- Assess offenders then don’t use it – everyone gets the same treatment
- Make errors and don’t correct
- Don’t assess offenders at all
- Do not adequately train staff in use or interpretation
- Assessment instruments are not validated or normed
Most Effective Behavioral Models

• Structured social learning where new skills and behavioral are modeled
• Cognitive behavioral approaches that target criminogenic risk factors
• Family based approaches that train family on appropriate techniques
Social Learning

Refers to several processes through which individuals acquire attitudes, behavior, or knowledge from the persons around them. Both modeling and instrumental conditioning appear to play a role in such learning
The Four Principles of Cognitive Intervention

1. Thinking affects behavior

2. Antisocial, distorted, unproductive irrational thinking causes antisocial and unproductive behavior

3. Thinking can be influenced

4. We can change how we feel and behave by changing what we think
Recent Meta-Analysis of Cognitive Behavioral Treatment for Offenders by Landenberger & Lipsey (2005)*

• Reviewed 58 studies:
  19 random samples
  23 matched samples
  16 convenience samples

• Found that on average CBT reduced recidivism by 25%, but the most effective configurations found more than 50% reductions
Factors Not significant:

- Type of research design
- Setting - prison (generally closer to end of sentence) versus community
- Juvenile versus adult
- Minorities or females
- Brand name
Significant Findings (effects were stronger if):

- Sessions per week (2 or more)
- Implementation monitored
- Staff trained on CBT
- Higher proportion of treatment completers
- Higher risk offenders
- Higher if CBT is combined with other services
Effects based on Cognitive targets:

• Cognitive restructuring
• Anger control
• Individual attention in addition to group sessions

Some Examples of Cognitive Behavioral Correctional Curriculums

- Controlling Anger and Learning to Manage It (CALM and CALMER)
- Aggression Replacement Therapy (ART)
- Criminal Conduct and Substance Abuse Treatment (adult & adolescent version)
- Thinking for a Change (T4C)
- Choices, Changes & Challenges
- Persistently Violent Curriculum
- Corrective Thinking/Truthought
- Reasoning and Rehabilitation
- Moral Reconciliation Therapy
- Drug Abuse Treatment Program (FBOP)
- Moving On (Female Offenders)
Cognitive Behavioral Approaches Based on Social Learning Theory

Cognitive Restructuring (What we think content)

Cognitive Skills Development (How we think: process)

Behavioral Strategies (Reinforcement and modeling prosocial behavior)
Treatment should be Behavioral in Nature

- Use rewards and punishers effectively
- Train, practice, rehearse offenders in prosocial alternatives
- Completion criteria should be based on acquisition of prosocial skills
For a new behavior to occur one must:

• Have a strong positive intention to perform the behavior
• Have the skills necessary to carry out the behavior, and
• Be in an environment that is free of constraints such that the behavior can occur
Skill Development

• Demonstrate, rehearse, practice prosocial alternatives

• Increase difficulty

• Completion based on acquisition of new prosocial skills
Effective Modeling

- Demonstrate behavior
- Specify the rewards for behaving this way
  - What do most people gain in the short & long term?
  - What can the person expect to gain?
- Provide reinforcement each and every time the person behaves in the desired way
One way is to structure groups around the quarter rule

- First ¼ spent reviewing what they learned last time
- Second ¼ demonstrate new skill
- Third ¼ practice new skill
- Fourth ¼ make practice more difficult
Develop a range of reinforcers

Three basic Types:

1. **Tangible** – material objects that have a personal value
2. **Token** – symbolic items that have value because of what they can be exchanged for or stand for
3. **Social** – natural rewards that are among the most powerful consequences for initiating and maintaining behaviors
Social reinforcers have several advantages

• Easy to administer
• Limitless supply
• Can be administered immediately after target behavior
• Are natural – consequences that people receive as a regular part of daily lives
Maximizing the Effectiveness of Rewards

• Reinforcement is most effective when it comes immediately after the behavior, however, this is not always practical. You can make a *promise of delayed reinforcer* (IOU).

• Remember, vary reinforcers since they will lose potency over time.

• Natural reinforcers should be used frequently (since they are likely to be received outside the program).

• Consistency is very important.

• Rewards should outnumber punishers by 4-1.

• Build rewards into program structure and train staff on use.
Punishers

• Designed to extinguishes inappropriate behavior

• Most effective are response cost (i.e. losing privileges, and disapproval)
Maximizing the Effectiveness of Punishers

• Escape should be impossible
• Should be applied immediately
• Should be applied at maximum intensity
• Should be applied after every occurrence of deviant behavior
• Should not be spread out & should be varied
• Remember, a punisher only trains a person what not to do: must also teach prosocial alternative
• When punishment is inappropriately applied several negative consequences can occur (unwanted emotional reactions, aggression, withdrawal, or increased behavior that is being punished)
What Doesn’t Work with Offenders?
Lakota tribal wisdom says that when you discover you are riding a dead horse, the best strategy is to dismount. However, in corrections, and in other affairs, we often try other strategies, including the following:

- Buy a stronger whip.
- Change riders
- Say things like “This is the way we always have ridden this horse.”
- Appoint a committee to study the horse.
- Arrange to visit other sites to see how they ride dead horses.
- Create a training session to increase our riding ability.
- Harness several dead horses together for increased speed.
- Declare that “No horse is too dead to beat.”
- Provide additional funding to increase the horse’s performance.
- Declare the horse is “better, faster, and cheaper” dead.
- Study alternative uses for dead horses.
- Promote the dead horse to a supervisory position.
Ineffective Approaches

- Drug prevention classes focused on fear and other emotional appeals
- Shaming offenders
- Drug education programs
- Non-directive, client centered approaches
- Bibliotherapy
- Freudian approaches
- Talking cures
- Self-Help programs
- Vague unstructured rehabilitation programs
- Medical model
- Fostering self-regard (self-esteem)
- “Punishing smarter” (boot camps, scared straight, etc.)
Effective programs evaluate what they do:

• Quality assurance processes (both internal and external)
• Assess offenders in meeting target behaviors
• Track offender recidivism
• Have an evaluator working with the program
Effect of Program Integrity on Recidivism: Results from Meta Analysis

Andrews and Dowden 1999

Percent Change in Recidivism

Specific Model 22 5
Trained Workers 23 7
Supervised Workers 33 7
Printed Manuals 28 12
Monitor Change 20 10
Adequate Dosage 22 9
Involved Researcher 45 8
Findings From Ohio—Adult Non-Residential Programs
Purpose of the Study

• The primary purpose of this study was to examine the Community Correction Act programs in Ohio to determine:
  
  • If they were effective in reducing recidivism, and if so,
  
  • Which programs were effective, and
  
  • What were the characteristics of the programs that were having an effect
Methodology

• Quasi experimental design—matched comparison cases

• Offender level data—over 13,000 offenders supervised in the community

• Program level data—aggregated from statewide database, file data, and staff surveys
Participants

- Two comparison groups for prison diversion
  - Parolees 55 sites
  - Probation 32 sites

- Two comparison groups for jail (11 sites)
  - Jail 3 sites
  - Probation 8 sites

- Total of 66 sites with some comparison group
Participants

• **Prison diversion**
  • All CCA offenders terminated in FY99 that spent at least 30 days in programming
  • Comparison cases were parolees released in FY99 (5,112)
  • Probationers that were terminated in FY99, 00, or 01 from regular supervision (2,343)

• Total unique CCA Prison Diversion 5,781
Results CCA Prison Diversions

- Overall, CCA (participants) less likely to recidivate than parolees (2%)

- Overall CCA participants more likely to recidivate than similar offenders under regular supervision (14%)
Results Jail Diversions

- Overall, Jail Diversions less likely to recidivate than jail inmates (6%)
- Overall Jail Diversions more likely to recidivate than similar offenders under regular supervision (6%)
Overall Outcome Evaluation Results

- Minimal effects when compared to parole/jail
- Increases in recidivism when compared to probation
- No difference between types of programs
Do Program Characteristics Matter?

• Wanted to determine if there were shared characteristics across effective programs

• 31 factors determined to be related to outcome
We were able to condense these 31 factors into four:

• Proportion of higher risk offenders in program

• Level of supervision for higher risk offenders

• More treatment for higher risk offenders

• More referrals for services for higher risk offenders
Changes in Recidivism by Program Factors for Probation Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>r-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Risk Sample</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk More Supervision</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk More Txt</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk More Referrals</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Change in Recidivism by 4 Point Factor Score for Probation Programs

![Bar chart showing the change in recidivism by 4 point factor score for probation programs. The chart has bars for 0 Factors, 1 or 2 Factors, and 3 Factors, with respective r-values of -0.13, 0.03, and 0.15.]
Lessons Learned

- Who you put in a program is important – pay attention to risk

- What you target is important – pay attention to criminogenic needs

- How you target offender for change is important – use behavioral approaches
Important Considerations

➢ Offender assessment is the engine that drives effective programs
  helps you know who & what to target
➢ Design programs around empirical research
  helps you know how to target offenders
➢ Program Integrity make a difference
  Service delivery, disruption of criminal networks, training/supervision of staff, support for program, QA, evaluation