

Journal of Correctional Education

- What Punishes? Inmates Rank the Severity of Prison vs. Intermediate Sanctions.....** *Joan Petersilia
Elizabeth Piper Deschenes*
- Using Day Reporting Centers as an Alternative to Jail.....** *David W. Diggs
Stephen L. Pieper*
- Locating Absconders: Results From a Randomized Field Experiment ...** *Faye S. Taxman
James M. Byrne*
- Rehabilitating Community Service Toward Restorative Service Sanctions in a Balanced Justice System.....** *Gordon Bazemore
Dennis Maloney*
- The Mirmont Evaluation: Drug Treatment as a Condition of Pretrial Release.....** *Thomas J. Wolf*
- An Analysis of Home Confinement as a Sanction Stephen J. Rackmill**
- Against Certain Offenders in the Labor Movement: A 19 U.S.C. 504.....** *Arthur L. Bowker*
- The Ideology of Black Correctional Officers in Georgia.....** *John A. Arthur*
- The Military Atmosphere of Boot Camps.....** *John P. Keenan
R. Barry Ruback
Judith G. Hadley*
- Intensive Rehabilitation Supervision: The Next Step in Community Corrections.....** *Paul Gendreau
Francis T. Cullen
James Bonta*
- The Law—LSD Sentence Modifications Raise Questions About the 18 U.S.C. 3606 Procedure.....** *Catharine M. Goodwin*

148328
148336

MARCH 1994

Federal Probation

A JOURNAL OF CORRECTIONAL PHILOSOPHY AND PRACTICE

Published by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts

VOLUME LVIII

MARCH 1994

NUMBER 1

This Issue in Brief

What Punishes? Inmates Rank the Severity of Prison vs. Intermediate Sanctions.—Are there intermediate sanctions that equate, in terms of punitiveness, with prison? Authors Joan Petersilia and Elizabeth Piper Deschenes report on a study designed to examine how inmates in Minnesota rank the severity of various criminal sanctions and which particular sanctions they judge equivalent in punitiveness. The authors also explore how inmates rank the difficulty of commonly imposed probation conditions and which offender background characteristics are associated with perceptions of sanction severity.

Using Day Reporting Centers as an Alternative to Jail.—An intermediate sanction gaining popularity is day reporting in which offenders live at home and report to the day reporting center regularly. Authors David W. Diggs and Stephen L. Pieper provide a brief history of day reporting centers and explain how such centers operate. They describe Orange County, Florida's day reporting center, which is designed to help control jail overcrowding and provide treatment and community reintegration for inmates.

Locating Absconders: Results From a Randomized Field Experiment.—Absconders are a problem for the criminal justice system, especially for probation agencies responsible for supervising offenders in the community. Authors Faye S. Taxman and James M. Byrne discuss how the Maricopa County (Arizona) Adult Probation Department addressed the problem by developing a warrants unit devoted to locating and apprehending absconders. They present the results of a randomized field experiment designed to test the effects of two different strategies for absconder location and apprehension.

Rehabilitating Community Service: Toward Restorative Service Sanctions in a Balanced Justice System.—While community service sanctions used to be regarded as potentially rehabilitative interventions for offenders, now they are often used as a punitive "add-on" requirement or not clearly linked to sentencing objectives. Authors Gordon Bazemore and Dennis Maloney argue that community service could be revitalized by developing principles and guidelines

for quality and performance based on a clear sanctioning policy and intervention mission. They propose restorative justice as a philosophical framework for community service and present the "Balanced Ap-

CONTENTS

What Punishes? Inmates Rank the Severity of Prison vs. Intermediate Sanctions. 148328 Joan Petersilia
Elizabeth Piper Deschenes 3

Using Day Reporting Centers as an Alternative to Jail. 148329 David W. Diggs
Stephen L. Pieper 9

Locating Absconders: Results From a Randomized Field Experiment 148330 Faye S. Taxman
James M. Byrne 13

Rehabilitating Community Service: Toward Restorative Service Sanctions in a Balanced Justice System 148331 Gordon Bazemore
Dennis Maloney 24

The Mirmont Evaluation: Drug Treatment as a Condition of Pretrial Release 148332 Thomas J. Wolf 36

An Analysis of Home Confinement as a Sanction 148333 Stephen J. Rackmill 45

Prohibition Against Certain Offenders in the Labor Movement: A Review of 29 U.S.C. 504 ... 148334 Arthur L. Bowker 53

Correctional Ideology of Black Correctional Officers in Georgia John A. Arthur 57

Measuring the Military Atmosphere of Boot Camps John P. Keenan
R. Barry Ruback
Judith G. Hadley 67

Departments 148335
Up to Speed 72
Looking at the Law 148336 79
Reviews of Professional Periodicals 85
Your Bookshelf on Review 94
It Has Come to Our Attention 102

Up to Speed*

A REVIEW OF RESEARCH FOR PRACTITIONERS

EDITED BY

RONALD P. CORBETT, JR.

*Deputy Commissioner, Massachusetts Probation Department
Vice President, National Association of Probation Executives*

AND

JOAN PETERSILIA, PH.D.

*Director, Criminal Justice Program, RAND
Associate Professor, School of Social Ecology, University of California, Irvine*

Intensive Rehabilitation Supervision: The Next Generation in Community Corrections?

BY PAUL GENDREAU, PH.D., FRANCIS T. CULLEN,
PH.D., AND JAMES BONTA, PH.D.**

SINCE THEIR inception in the early 1980's, "intensive supervision programs" (ISP's), which emphasize the close monitoring of offenders in the community, have spread rapidly across the United States. Today, virtually every state has some form of ISP for the supervision of parolees and probationers (Camp & Camp, 1993; Petersilia & Turner, 1993). It is estimated that over 120,000 offenders are now placed in ISP's (Camp & Camp, 1993).

Editor's Note: Federal Probation is pleased to introduce "Up to Speed," a column devoted to reporting on research of interest to criminal justice and corrections practitioners. The column is the brainchild of Ronald P. Corbett, Jr., and Joan Petersilia, who serve as column coeditors. According to them, "our goal was to create a vehicle to bring the news about important research to the attention of busy practitioners and policymakers in community corrections." We are fortunate to have them collaborating on our behalf—their combined experience in practice and in research is considerable. Mr. Corbett has worked in corrections for more than 20 years and currently serves as the deputy commissioner of the Massachusetts Probation Department. Dr. Petersilia is the director of RAND's Criminal Justice Program and is a professor of criminology at the University of California, Irvine. She has directed major studies in policing, sentencing, career criminals, corrections, and racial discrimination. Both Mr. Corbett and Dr. Petersilia have published widely.

***Dr. Gendreau is professor of psychology and director of the graduate unit at the Saint John Campus of the University of New Brunswick. Dr. Cullen is distinguished research professor, Department of Criminal Justice, University of Cincinnati. Dr. Bonta is chief, Corrections Research, Ministry Secretariat, Solicitor General, Canada. The collaboration on this article came about as a result of the authors' participation in the conference, "What Works in Community Corrections? A Consensus Conference," sponsored by the International Association of Residential and Community Alternatives, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, November 3-6, 1993.*

Although exceptions exist, the distinctive feature of ISP's is an abiding faith in the power of the threat of punishment to effect prosocial conformity. ISP programs emphasize supervision that is "intensive" in the sense that the goal is to watch offenders diligently. Thus, probation and parole officers are given reduced caseloads, and they are expected to have more frequent contacts with offenders, sometimes unannounced, and over a longer time period. In addition to this scrutiny, ISP's often incorporate other forms of surveillance such as drug testing and home confinement or electronic monitoring. Meanwhile, offender rehabilitation, the cornerstone of traditional community corrections, recedes to secondary importance or is disdained as irrelevant to the program's mission.

This more intrusive control of offenders (and abandonment of treatment), argue ISP advocates, will enhance public safety, help alleviate prison crowding, and save money for governmental jurisdictions facing the expensive proposition of imprisoning a growing number of offenders. First, the increased surveillance and the threat of various sanctions will induce a commensurate fear of punishment for offenders in ISP's. As a consequence, offenders will be less likely to break the law than if they had been placed on traditional probation or parole where monitoring is less frequent and the threat of sanctions is less severe. Second, given the presumed efficacy of intensive supervision in scaring offenders straight, these offenders would, in effect, be diverted from incarceration. Control in the community would maintain public safety and also accomplish a large cost saving by reducing the flow of offenders into overcrowded prisons.

The intractable problem of prison crowding and its corresponding drain on the public treasury has been a catalyst in the proliferation of ISP's over the last decade (Clear & Hardyman, 1990; DeJong & Franzen, 1993; Petersilia & Turner, 1993). But, more than this has been at work: the prevailing punitive context also must be considered (Currie, 1985; Scheingold,

1984). Unlike traditional community corrections programs that could be discredited as liberal attempts to coddle offenders, ISP's were also touted as a means of policing law-breakers—as another weapon in the arsenal to get tough on crime. Promising control and punishment, in short, struck a responsive chord among policymakers wishing to stem escalating corrections budgets while avoiding the risk of appearing easy on crime.

The growth of ISP's attests to their political attractiveness, but now, after a decade of experimentation, it is time to assess whether they have lived up to their promise. As we review below, the existing evaluation research suggests that ISP's with a strong focus on control are not an effective correctional intervention. However, there is beginning evidence that supervision programs which merge control with rehabilitation achieve more favorable results. When seen in the context of the growing evidence demonstrating the effectiveness of correctional treatment, these latter ISP findings provide a basis for considering a new generation of community corrections programs that not only supervise but also rehabilitate offenders. These programs, which we call *intensive rehabilitation supervision* (IRS), should be informed by the existing knowledge base on offender classification and on the principles of effective correctional treatment. Initial guidelines for integrating this knowledge into future IRS programs are presented.

The First Generation of Community Supervision Programs

The Limits of Control

The first generation of ISP's was greeted with enthusiasm, both in the press (e.g., *New York Times*, Dec. 18, 1985) and by criminal justice professionals (e.g., Conrad, 1986). The two prominent ISP's in this regard originated in Georgia and New Jersey and appeared to generate positive results (Erwin, 1986; Pearson, 1988; Pearson & Harper, 1990). This initial optimism, however, proved misleading. Gendreau and Ross (1987) pointed out that the reductions in recidivism reported for offenders in the Georgia ISP compared to those who were incarcerated were modest at best. More importantly, there were no differences in recidivism between the ISP and regular probation groups. In addition, the evaluations of both programs were questioned on a variety of methodological grounds (Byrne, 1990; Tonry, 1990; Tonry & Will, 1988). Finally, the majority of ISP evaluations in other jurisdictions "do not support the notion that 'intensive' supervision significantly reduces the risk of offender recidivism" (Byrne & Pattavina, 1992, p. 296, emphasis in original; see also Cullen, Wright, & Applegate, 1993).

Even more pessimistic news has just come from research conducted by Joan Petersilia and colleagues at Rand (Petersilia & Turner, 1993). The scope of the Rand evaluation was impressive as it included 14 sites that used Georgia's control-oriented model of ISP. Offenders were randomly assigned to ISP and regular probation control groups. The original Georgia results were replicated; the recidivism rates for ISP offenders did not differ significantly from those of regular probationers.

In terms of cost savings, the researchers failed to find one site that realized a cost saving. As the authors note, the expenses involved in maintaining an ISP had been underestimated. In fact, ISP's may cost about three times what regular probation does (Gendreau, Paparozzi, Little, & Goddard, 1993), and, in some instances, specific components of ISP's such as drug testing can be prohibitively expensive (e.g., Britt, Gottfredson, & Goldkamp, 1992). In addition, claims that ISPs may be cost-effective (New Jersey and Georgia) are very much open to question (Tonry, 1990).

The failure of ISP's to produce striking results in reducing recidivism would not surprise those familiar with the relevant criminological and psychological research. Underlying ISP's is the theory of deterrence—that is, the notion that offenders can be compelled to behave prosocially by the threat of enhanced punishment. This idea has achieved little empirical support in the criminological literature (Finckenauer, 1982; Paternoster, 1987; Walker, 1989). Furthermore, the results are not at all surprising when the massive psychological literature on punishment and attitude change is considered. This literature has been totally ignored by ISP program designers.

This literature has been summarized in regard to the current crop of punishment-oriented ISP's (Gendreau, 1993; Gendreau & Goddard, 1994; Gendreau & Ross, 1981). Briefly, the major findings from laboratory and clinical studies of punishment show that punishment is effective in suppressing behavior under a limited set of conditions. To be effective, punishment must be: a) immediate, b) at maximum intensity, c) varied (to avoid habituation effects), d) always contingent upon the disapproved behavior, and e) impossible to escape from. When these punishment principles are weighed with factors such as the personality characteristics of offenders (e.g., psychopathy, neutralization cognitions that dismiss negative consequences) and socialization experiences that likely make them resistant to punishment, it becomes difficult to imagine why ISP's would have much influence on offenders' behavior. Additionally, there is no solid experimental or clinical evidence that the ISP sanctions currently in use, with the exception of fines, are effective punishers.

To ensure effective punishment, ISP's must *always* adhere to these aforementioned principles, but to do so in the "real world" is far beyond the logistical and ethical scope of any ISP. This conclusion not only applies to ISP programs with a punishment ideology but other community-based programs that stress punishment or the threat of punishment.

The Promise of Rehabilitation

Despite this bleak picture of ISP's, the current evaluation studies have yielded an important insight: while there is little evidence for the effectiveness of increased surveillance and the threat of punishment, a few intensive supervision programs have reported reductions in recidivism. What kind of ISP's are these?

As it turns out, the ISP's that have demonstrated reductions in recidivism are those that went beyond simple control and also attempted to provide a significant treatment component (Jolin & Stipak, 1992; Paparozzi & Gendreau, 1993; Pearson, 1988). The most compelling data come from the latter two studies which were based in New Jersey. Paparozzi's Bureau of Parole program deliberately targeted only high risk parolees. Across three indices, the recidivism rates for the ISP group were 21-29 percent lower than for a carefully matched sample of regular parolees. Secondly, critiques of the Pearson (1988) study have overlooked the fact that reductions in recidivism were 30 percent lower for those in ISP versus a comparison group in the case of the highest-risk probationers. It should be noted, however, that the quality of the services in these programs is unknown.

Finally, while the ISP's evaluated by Byrne and Kelly (1989) and Petersilia and Turner (1991) showed no overall reduction in recidivism compared to regular probation control groups, they did find that probationers who received more or better quality services while under supervision had lower recidivism rates.

IRS: The Second Generation of Community Supervision Programs

Based on the existing empirical evidence, a persuasive case can be made for abandoning intensive supervision programs that seek only to control and punish offenders in favor of programs that give equal primacy to changing offenders. ISP's, moreover, may provide a unique opportunity for effective rehabilitation. Given their extensive contact with offenders, probation and parole officers should have the time needed to enhance the delivery of services and to monitor their clients' progress. We might also add that intensive rehabilitation supervision programs have a good prospect of receiving political support. By retaining "intensive supervision," the programs would not weaken surveillance over offenders, and by systematically incorporat-

ing treatment, intensive rehabilitation supervision (IRS) could offer the realistic hope of lower recidivism rates. More generally, research is clear in showing that the public favors correctional interventions that both control and rehabilitate (Cullen & Gendreau, 1989; Cullen, Skovron, Scott, & Burton, 1990).

Who Gets into IRS: Risk/Needs Assessment

A glaring weakness of the first generation ISP's is that there is no unifying theoretical basis for the selection of offenders for program participation. On the face of it, one would expect that ISP's would be reserved for the higher-risk offender who would supposedly benefit from increased control. However, after yielding to political pressure to get tough on everyone, using subjective as opposed to objective risk assessments, and allowing judges' discretion in sentencing to ISP's, many ISP's are left with a limited range of offenders who fall in the lower-risk categories (Gendreau & Ross, 1987; Tonry, 1990).

While reviewers of the rehabilitation literature may debate the overall potency of treatment, they do not dispute the fact that some treatment programs are effective in reducing recidivism for some offenders. The trick is identifying for *which* offenders treatment is most effective. Andrews, Bonta, and Hoge (1990) described a number of general principles that guides the matching of offender to treatment. The first two principles, the risk and need principles, are particularly relevant to our proposal to marry ISP with treatment in the form of IRS.

The risk principle states that treatment will more likely be effective when treatment services are matched with the risk level of the offender. That is, intensive services should be provided for higher-risk offenders and minimal services for lower-risk offenders. Mismatching level of service with offender risk has seldom shown reductions in recidivism (Andrews & Bonta, 1994; Andrews, Zinger, Hoge, Bonta, Gendreau, & Cullen, 1990). As we have noted, many ISP programs do not target higher risk offenders, although they provide a structural setting for sustaining intensive services. More frequent monitoring and supervision, however, are simply not equivalent to intensive rehabilitation services. After all, hypochondriacs may visit doctors daily, and they do not necessarily get better. What becomes important is what the doctor does with the patient during those visits, and part of the answer comes from the second principle.

The need principle recognizes two types of offender needs: criminogenic and noncriminogenic (e.g., Andrews & Bonta, 1994). Criminogenic needs are actually *dynamic* risk factors. A dynamic risk factor is one that can change over time. Some examples in this regard are an offender's attitudes towards employ-

ment, peers, authority, and substance abuse. The importance of criminogenic needs is that they serve as treatment goals: when programs successfully diminish these needs, we can reasonably expect reduction in recidivism. Some examples of noncriminogenic needs are anxiety, depression, and self-esteem; when programs target these types of needs, reductions in recidivism are negligible (Andrews & Bonta, 1994).

From our description of the risk and need principles, we hope that the reader sees the important implications for the design of IRS programs. Basically, IRS programs should target higher-risk clientele and provide rehabilitation services aimed at reducing criminogenic needs. In order to achieve these goals, the first step requires systematic risk-needs assessment.

Most offender assessment/classification instruments are simple risk instruments composed of items measuring an offender's past criminal history (Bonta, 1993). An example is the Salient Factor Score (Hoffman, 1983). All but one of the seven items are historical; that is, they relate to an offender's past, e.g., number of previous convictions, age at first arrest, rather than his or her current behavior and attitudes. Although they may achieve reasonable predictive accuracy and could be helpful in directing higher-risk offenders into IRS programs, they fail to provide the dynamic risk factors needed for effective treatment planning.

In contrast the more recently developed risk-needs assessment instruments include not only criminal history items but also information of a dynamic quality. The criminogenic needs information can then provide staff assistance in identifying problematic aspects of the offender's situation requiring attention in order to reduce the risk of reoffending.

To our knowledge, there are only three risk-needs classification instruments in widespread use (we do not include personality-based assessments such as the I-Level and Megargee-MMPI because of the general lack of post-program predictive validity; see Andrews & Bonta, 1994). These three instruments are the Level of Supervision Inventory (LSI) (Andrews & Bonta, 1994), the Wisconsin classification system (Baird, 1931), and the Community Risk/Needs Management Scale used by the Correctional Services of Canada (Motiuk, 1993). Only the LSI and the Community Risk/Needs Management Scale were developed specifically with the risk and needs principle considered. At this point in time, only the LSI has shown post-probation dynamic risk validity. That is, changes in offender needs, as measured by the LSI, were associated with changes in recidivism. Analyses of the two other systems show some promise with respect to dynamic risk (Bonta, Andrews, & Motiuk, 1993), but more direct evidence is still lacking.

In short, systematic risk-needs assessment should be used to guide the selection of offenders into IRS programs. Interventions developed for these offenders should be based on specific treatment principles, with risk and need principles forming the general context for treatment.

Principles of Effective Correctional Treatment

Even though the anti-rehabilitation "nothing works" rhetoric took firm hold in the United States for a variety of sociopolitical reasons (Cullen & Gendreau, 1989), dedicated clinicians and researchers have continued to generate data on the effectiveness of offender rehabilitation programs. For the interested reader, this evidence can be found in a variety of published critical narrative reviews and meta-analyses of the offender-treatment outcome literature (Andrews & Bonta, 1994; Andrews et al., 1990; Cullen & Gendreau, 1989; Garrett, 1985; Gendreau, 1993; Gendreau & Andrews, 1990; Gendreau & Ross, 1979; 1984; 1987; Gottschalk, Davidson, Mayer, & Gensheimer, 1987; Izzo & Ross, 1990; Lipsey, 1992; Losel, 1993; Palmer, 1992).

What are the results from these studies? First, if one surveys all the treatment studies that had control group comparisons, as Mark Lipsey (1992) did for 443 studies, 64 percent of the studies reported reductions in favor of the treatment group. The average reduction in recidivism summed across the 443 studies was 10 percent. Secondly, according to Lipsey, when the results were broken down by the general type of program (e.g., employment), reductions in recidivism ranged from 10 to 18 percent.

It is not enough, however, simply to sum across studies or to partition them into general programmatic categories. The salient question is, what are the characteristics that distinguish between effective and ineffective programs? What exactly is done under the name of "employment"? Therefore, based on the literature reviews and to a lesser extent on the documented clinical wisdom of our treatment colleagues, we have discovered that programs which adhered to most of the characteristics to be described below, reduced recidivism in the range of 25 to 80 percent with an average of about 40 percent. A summary of these characteristics is provided. As well, we also include a listing of the principles of ineffective programs. Such knowledge is likely just as important as knowing "what works."

Principles of What Works

A) *Risk principle: Intensive services, behavioral in nature, are provided to higher risk offenders.*

- i) Intensive services occupy 40-70 percent of the offender's time and of 3 to 9 months duration.

ii) Behavioral programs range from radical behaviorism (e.g., token economies) to cognitive social learning strategies that employ modeling, cognitive restructuring, and explicit reinforcement of alternatives to antisocial styles of thinking, feeling, and acting.

B) Need principle: The goal of treatment is to reduce criminogenic needs.

i) Therapist and program providers must clearly differentiate criminogenic from noncriminogenic needs and ensure that the program targets criminogenic needs.

ii) Program success is partly measured by the reduction of criminogenic needs.

C) Responsivity: The style and mode of treatment is matched to the offender.

i) The learning style and personality of the offender are matched with the program. For example, impulsive offenders and those who prefer a high degree of structure may benefit from a token economy program.

ii) Offenders are matched with the therapist, e.g., "anxious" offenders may respond better to more relaxed and calmer therapists.

iii) Therapists are matched with the type of program, e.g., therapists who have a concrete conceptual level for problem solving may function best in a radical behavioral program.

D) Program contingencies / behavioral strategies are enforced in a firm but fair manner.

i) Reinforcement contingencies are designed with meaningful input from offenders but remain under the control of the staff. Nondirective counseling programs do not seem to work with offenders.

ii) Positive reinforcers outweigh punishers by a 4:1 ratio.

iii) Internal controls are established to maintain prosocial behaviors and discourage antisocial behaviors in the absence of external contingencies.

E) Therapists relate to offenders in interpersonally sensitive and constructive ways and are trained and supervised appropriately.

i) Therapists have at least an undergraduate degree or equivalent, with knowledge of the theories of criminal behavior and of the prediction and treatment literature.

ii) Therapists receive 3 to 6 months of formal and on-the-job/internship training in the application

of behavioral interventions generally and specific to the program.

iii) Therapists are reassessed periodically on quality of service delivery.

iv) Therapists monitor offender change on criminogenic needs.

F) The program structure and activities should disrupt the criminal network.

G) There is a high level of advocacy and brokerage as long as the community agency offers appropriate services.

i) Community services should be assessed in as objective a manner as possible, for example, the Correctional Program Assessment Inventory or CPAI (Gendreau & Andrews, 1993), so as to ensure that quality services applicable to the offenders and their problems are provided. All too often this is not the case. In a recent survey of 112 offender substance abuse programs using the CPAI, only 10 percent had programmatic elements that would lead one to believe that an effective service was being provided (Gendreau & Goggin, 1990).

Principles of What Does Not Work

A) Programs, including behavioral, that target low risk offenders.

B) Programs that target offender need factors not predictive of criminal behavior (e.g., anxiety, depression, self-esteem).

C) Traditional Freudian psychodynamic and Rogerian nondirective therapies.

These programs, at least in the offender treatment literature, have been characterized as follows:

i) "talking" cures,

ii) good relationship with the client is the primary goal,

iii) unravelling the unconscious,

iv) gaining insight as the major goal,

v) resolving neurotic conflicts and self-actualizing,

vi) externalizing blame to parents, staff, victims, society,

vii) ventilating anger.

D) Traditional "medical model" approaches.

i) diet change,

ii) pharmacological, e.g., testosterone suppressants for sex offenders,

iii) plastic surgery.

E) *Subcultural and labeling approaches.*

For a more complete review of these approaches see Andrews and Bonta (1994). Briefly, they note that interventions based on the following views are ineffective:

- i) Respect offenders' culture.
- ii) Provide legitimate opportunities only.
- iii) Rely on incidental learning. Somehow offenders will "get it" with minimal guidance.
- iv) Divert offenders from the stigmatization of the criminal justice system. This will be sufficient to reduce criminal behavior.
- v) Use alternative sanctions with lower levels of punishment; these punishments are supposedly dignified and just, while treatment is coercive and does an injustice to offenders.

F) *Deterrence or "punishing smarter" strategies.*

This category includes the first generation ISP's described in this column, as well as bootcamps, electronic monitoring, scared straight, and shock incarceration. Gendreau and Little (1993) have conducted a preliminary meta-analysis of this literature. Their analysis consisted of 174 comparisons between a "punishment" group and a control group. The punishment/deterrence strategies produced slight increases in recidivism. Also of note is that both Cullen et al.'s (1993) narrative review of this literature and Andrews, Zinger et al.'s (1990) meta-analysis reached similar conclusions.

Intensive Rehabilitation Supervision: The Future

The empirical evidence regarding ISP's is decisive: without a rehabilitation component, reductions in recidivism are as elusive as a desert mirage. This leaves community corrections somewhat at a crossroad. The choice is between (1) abandoning ISP's and returning to regular probation and parole supervision or (2) incorporating effective rehabilitation programming into the intensive monitoring conducted within ISP's. The first choice would be difficult: too much is invested politically in these programs.

The second choice, a new generation of intensive community programming, is more palatable. IRS holds the hope of reduced recidivism within a context of public support. The switch, however, from ISP's to IRS's will not be easy.

First of all, program developers must familiarize themselves with the extensive rehabilitation and punishment literature. For many, this will be foreign territory. Second, for staff who have become accustomed to a "law enforcement" role, incorporating a therapeutic

role may bring confusion and conflict. Tonry (1990) has outlined some of the areas of resistance in this regard. Third, the temptation will be to provide IRS to all clientele instead of targeting the higher-risk offender. Not only would this be in contradiction to the risk principle, but it also would widen the net of state control. Finally, there is the question of costs. Training staff to adopt new roles and learn new skills will certainly require the expenditure of resources.

There are probably other unforeseen obstacles, but they are not, in our view, insurmountable. The principles of effective rehabilitation can be taught, staff supported in the transition to new roles, and objective risk-needs assessments adopted to guide the identification of offenders for IRS. In terms of costs, traditional ISP's along with their adjunct programs (electronic monitoring, urinalysis) are extremely expensive. Diverting this money to rehabilitation programs at least has the promise of producing reduced recidivism. There already seems to be a modest movement towards incorporating treatment into ISP's and targeting higher-risk offenders (see the New Jersey studies), but it is more haphazard rather than planned. We think the time for this movement to accelerate in a systematic and proactive manner is now opportune. To maintain the status quo is clearly unacceptable.

REFERENCES

- Andrews, D.A., & Bonta, J. (1994). *The psychology of criminal conduct*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.
- Andrews, D.A., Bonta, J., & Hoge, R.D. (1990). Classification for effective rehabilitation: Rediscovering psychology. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 17, 19-52.
- Andrews, D.A., Zinger, I., Hoge, R.D., Bonta, J., Gendreau, P., & Cullen, F.T. (1990). Does correctional treatment work? A psychologically informed meta-analysis. *Criminology*, 28, 369-404.
- Baird, S.C. (1981). Probation and parole classification: The Wisconsin model. *Corrections Today*, 43, 36-41.
- Bonta, J. (1993, November). *Risk-needs assessment and treatment*. Presentation at a conference of the International Association of Residential and Community Alternatives, Philadelphia, PA.
- Bonta, J., Andrews, D.A., & Motiuk, L.L. (1993, October). *Dynamic risk assessment and effective treatment*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Society of Criminology, Phoenix, AZ.
- Britt, C.H., Gottfredson, M.R., & Goldkamp, J.S. (1992). Drug testing and pretrial misconduct: An experiment on the specific deterrent effects of drug monitoring defendants on pretrial release. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 29, 62-78.
- Byrne, J.M. (1990). The future of intensive probation supervision and the new intermediate sanctions. *Crime and Delinquency*, 36, 6-41.
- Byrne, J.M., & Kelly, L. (1989). *Restructuring probation as an intermediate sanction: An evaluation of the Massachusetts Intensive Supervision Program*. Final report to the National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice, Research Program on the Punishment and Control of Offenders, Washington, DC.
- Byrne, J.M., & Pattavina, A. (1992). The effectiveness issue: Assessing what works in the adult community corrections system. In

- J.M. Byrne, A.J. Lurigio, & J. Petersilia (Eds.), *Smart sentencing: The emergence of intermediate sanctions* (pp. 281-306). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Camp, G.M., & Camp, C.G. (1993). *The corrections yearbook: Probation and parole*. South Salem, NY: Criminal Justice Institute.
- Clear, T., & Hardyman, P.L. (1990). The new intensive supervision movement. *Crime and Delinquency*, 36, 42-60.
- Conrad, J.P. (1986). News of the future: Research & development in corrections. *Federal Probation*, 49(2), 82-84.
- Cullen, F.T., & Gendreau, P. (1989). The effectiveness of correctional rehabilitation: Reconsidering the "Nothing Works" debate. In L. Goodstein & D. MacKenzie (Eds.), *American prisons: Issues in research and policy* (pp. 23-44). New York: Plenum.
- Cullen, F.T., Skovron, S.E., Scott, J.E., & Burton, V.S. (1990). Public support for correctional rehabilitation: The tenacity of the rehabilitation ideal. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 17, 6-18.
- Cullen, F.T., Wright, J.P., & Applegate, B.K. (1993, November). *Control in the community*. Presentation at a conference of the International Association of Residential and Community Alternatives, Philadelphia, PA.
- Currie, E. (1985). *Confronting crime: An American challenge*. New York: Pantheon.
- DeJong, W., & Franzen, S. (1993). On the role of intermediate sanctions in corrections reform: The views of criminal justice professionals. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 16, 47-73.
- Erwin, B.S. (1986). Turning up the heat on probationers in Georgia. *Federal Probation*, 50, 17-24.
- Finckenauer, J. O. (1982). *Scared straight! and the panacea problem*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Garrett, C.J. (1985). Effects of residential treatment on adjudicated delinquents: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 22, 287-308.
- Gendreau, P. (1993, November). *The principles of effective intervention with offenders*. Presentation at a conference of the International Association of Residential and Community Alternatives, Philadelphia, PA.
- Gendreau, P., & Andrews, D.A. (1990). Tertiary prevention: What the meta-analysis of the offender treatment literature tells us about "what works." *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 32, 173-184.
- Gendreau, P., & Andrews, D.A. (1993). *The correctional program assessment inventory* (3rd ed.). University of New Brunswick, Saint John, N.B. and Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario.
- Gendreau, P., & Goddard, M. (1994). *The realities of punishment*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Gendreau, P., & Ross, R.R. (1981). Correctional potency: Treatment and deterrence on trial. In R. Roesch & R.R. Corrado (Eds.), *Evaluation and criminal justice policy* (pp. 29-57). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Gendreau, P., & Ross, R.R. (1984). Correctional treatment: Some recommendations for successful intervention. *Juvenile and Family Court Journal*, 34, 31-40.
- Gendreau, P., & Ross, R.R. (1979). Effective correctional treatment: Bibliotherapy for cynics. *Crime and Delinquency*, 25, 463-489.
- Gendreau, P., & Little, T. (1993). *A meta-analysis of the effectiveness of sanctions on offender recidivism*. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Psychology, University of New Brunswick, Saint John.
- Gendreau, P., Paparozzi, M., Little, T., & Goddard, M. (1993). Punishing smarter: The effectiveness of the new generation of alternative sanctions. *Forum on Correctional Research*, 5, 31-34.
- Gendreau, P., & Ross, R. R. (1987). Revivification of rehabilitation: Evidence from the 1980s. *Justice Quarterly*, 4, 349-407.
- Gottschalk, R., Davidson, W.S., Mayer, J., & Gensheimer, R. (1987). Behavioral approaches with juvenile offenders: A meta-analysis of long-term treatment efficacy. In E.K. Morris & C. J. Braukman (Eds.), *Behavioral approaches to crime and delinquency: A handbook of application, research, and concepts* (pp. 399-422). New York: Plenum Press.
- Hoffman, P. B. (1983). Screening for risk: A revised salient factor score (SFS 81). *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 11, 539-547.
- Izzo, R., & Ross, R.R. (1990). Meta-analysis of rehabilitation programs for juvenile delinquents: A brief report. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 17, 134-142.
- Jolin, A., & Stipak, B. (1992). Drug treatment and electronically monitored home confinement: An evaluation of a community-based sentencing option. *Crime and Delinquency*, 38, 158-170.
- Lipsey, M.W. (1992). Juvenile delinquency treatment: A meta-analytic inquiry into the variability of effects. In T.D. Cook, H. Cooper, D.S. Cordray, H. Hartmann, L.V. Hedges, R.J. Light, T.A. Louis, & F. Mosteller, (Eds.), *Meta-analysis for explanation* (pp. 83-127). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Losel, F. (1993, November). *Evaluating psychosocial interventions in prison and other contexts*. Paper presented at the Twentieth Criminological Conference, Strasbourg, Germany.
- Motiuk, L.L. (1993). Where are we in our ability to assess risk? *Forum on Corrections Research*, 5, 14-19.
- Palmer, T. (1992). *The re-emergence of correctional intervention*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Paparozzi, M., & Gendreau, P. (1993). *An ISP that works!: Treatment, organizational supportiveness and probation officer roles*. Unpublished manuscript. Bureau of Parole, Trenton, NJ.
- Paternoster, R. (1987). The deterrent effect of perceived certainty and severity of punishment: A review of the evidence and issues. *Justice Quarterly*, 4, 173-217.
- Pearson, F. S. (1988). Evaluation of New Jersey's Intensive Supervision Program. *Crime and Delinquency*, 34, 437-448.
- Pearson, F. S., & Harper, A. G. (1990). Contingent intermediate sentences: New Jersey's Intensive Supervision Program. *Crime and Delinquency*, 36, 75-86.
- Petersilia, J., & Turner, S. (1993). Intensive probation and parole. In M. Tonry & N. Morris (Eds.), *Crime and justice: An annual review of the research* (Vol. 17). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Petersilia, J., & Turner, S. (1991). An evaluation of intensive probation in California. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 82, 610-658.
- Scheingold, S. A. (1984). *The politics of law and order: Street crime and public policy*. New York: Longman.
- Tonry, M. (1990). Stated and latent functions of ISP. *Crime and Delinquency*, 36, 174-190.
- Tonry, M., & Will. (1988). *Intermediate sanctions: Preliminary report to the National Institute of Justice*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Walker, S. (1989). *Sense and nonsense about crime: A policy guide*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.