

# Research in Review

Bureau of Management Information Services

Division of Planning, Research and Statistics

Editor: Gary Zajac (717)730-2725

## *Summary and Major Findings of Articles Reviewed in This Issue*

David Farabee, et alii. 1999. "Barriers to Implementing Effective Correctional Treatment Programs." *The Prison Journal*, 79(2), 150-162. Page 3

This article presents a discussion of the difficulties that commonly arise during the establishment of intensive, prison-based drug treatment programs (e.g. therapeutic communities). The authors identify six major barriers to implementation. The authors offer suggestions for overcoming these barriers.

Glenn D. Walters. 1999. "Short-Term Outcome of Inmates Participating in the Lifestyle Change Program." *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 26(3), 322-337. Page 5

This article reports on the evaluation of a program designed to prepare federal inmates for re-socialization into mainstream society. The evaluation found marginal program impacts upon recidivism, but more significant impacts upon adjustment to the institution. Thus, programs like these may be more valuable for regulating institutional behavior than for preparing offenders for release to the community.

Richard P. Seiter and Mark S. Fleisher. 1999. "The Responsibility Model and Teaching Prosocial Values to Inmates." *Corrections Management Quarterly*, 3(3), 57-65. Page 6

This article reports on a preliminary evaluation of the Residential Values Program, a program designed to teach prosocial values to federal inmates. This study finds that the program has a positive impact upon inmate institutional adjustment. Unfortunately, the impact of the program upon post-release behavior is not assessed.

Kathleen J. Block. 1999. "Bringing Scouting To Prison: Programs and Challenges." *The Prison Journal*, 79(2), 269-283. Page 8

This article reviews the establishment of the Girl Scouts Beyond Bars programs in Maryland and other states. This study collected data from programs in nine states and found that common challenges facing these programs include membership turnover and emotional demands on staff and volunteers. On the whole, though, the programs were found to be running well.

David Shichor. 1999. "Privatizing Correctional Institutions: An Organizational Perspective." *The Prison Journal*, 79(2), 289-304. Page 9

Perspective." *The Prison Journal*, 79(2), 226-249.

This article examines the controversial issue of prison privatization from the perspective of organizational theory. Private correctional facilities are associated with an entirely different set of organizational structures and forces than is the case with public institutions. Though heavily theoretical, this article presents some interesting background discussion related to privatization.

Scott D. Camp. 1999. "Do Inmate Survey Data Reflect Prison Conditions? Using Surveys to Assess Prison Conditions of Confinement." *The Prison Journal*, 79(2), 250-268. Page 10

This article reviews the utility and validity of standard survey research methods as a means of gathering information from inmates about their conditions of confinement. This study finds that inmate responses to such surveys achieve an acceptable level of accuracy and reliability. Close attention must be paid, though, to the design of surveys for these special populations.

### **Research Notes**

The following report on the control of institutional drug use was authored by Andy Keyser, along with Thomas Feucht of the National Institute of Justice.

Thomas E. Feucht and Andrew Keyser. 1999. "Reducing Drug Use in Prisons: Pennsylvania's Approach." *National Institute of Justice Journal*, October, 10-15.

This article reports on the outcome of the Drug Interdiction Program implemented by the department in 1995. Prior to the introduction of this program, drug use in the State Correctional Institutions had become a serious concern, with significant ramifications for the safety of staff, inmates and the general public. The program is a comprehensive strategy of random and targeted drug testing, detection, interdiction, sanctioning and treatment. To evaluate the impact of this program, the department worked with the National Institute of Justice to collect hair and urine samples from over 1,000 inmates in 1996 (pre-test) and again in 1998 (post-test). The percentage of inmates testing positive for any substance dropped from 7.8 percent in the 1996 sample to 1.4 percent in the 1998 sample. These findings indicate that the Drug Interdiction Program has significantly reduced the drug problem in the Pennsylvania prison system. This article presents a useful and interesting discussion of strategies for the control of institutional drug use.

The following research study was reviewed in the September 1999 issue of the National Criminal Justice Association *Justice Bulletin*. Additional information is available upon request.

Dina R. Rose. *Coercive Mobility and Crime: Incarceration and Social Disorganization*. New York: John Jay College of Criminal Justice.

This research explores the impact of incarceration upon social stability within communities. Research on a sample of Florida communities finds that high incarceration rates may actually contribute to an increase in crime rates. When incarceration rates for a community reach a critical mass (or a "tipping point"), the resulting social disintegration may contribute to more crime. High incarceration rates contribute to unemployment, to the disruption of social networks and of civic spirit, and to an acceptance of imprisonment as a normal life experience. These factors can lead to the erosion of civic bonds and informal social controls that serve as a check on criminal deviance in most communities. Although additional exploration of this issue is clearly needed, this research contributes to the ongoing discussion about the impact of incarceration upon our society.

We are pleased to introduce book reviews as a new feature of *Research in Review*. When possible, guest editors will provide reviews of books that are of interest to corrections professionals. The first book reviewed in this forum is *Choosing Correctional Options that Work*, by Alan Harland of Temple University. This review was written by Melissa Swauger, a Pennsylvania Management Intern who recently did a rotation with PRS. In addition to the brief review provided below, Melissa has prepared a more detailed set of notes on the book. These are available upon request. We at PRS thank Melissa for reviewing this book.

### *Detailed Reviews*

David Farabee, et alii. 1999. "Barriers to Implementing Effective Correctional Drug Treatment Programs." *The Prison Journal*, 79(2), 150-162.

**This article examines the process of creating and maintaining intensive corrections treatment programs. Implementation is identified as a key variable affecting the real and perceived success of drug treatment programs. In identifying six common barriers to implementation, and in offering solutions to these problems, the authors make a contribution to the understanding of prison-based treatment programs.**

The authors begin with a discussion of the growth in the number of drug-related and drug addicted offenders over the past two decades. This growth has stimulated concern about how to prepare these offenders for sobriety upon release to the community. Federal funding for prison drug treatment has driven the expansion of intensive, residential drug treatment programs in many states. The assumption underlying the development of these programs is that they are generally successful in eliminating or reducing drug use among offenders, and in helping offenders to re-adjust to society.

While there are several major studies demonstrating the effectiveness of intensive prison-based drug treatment, the authors argue that most of these studies have focused upon programs that have benefited from extensive technical assistance and from detailed study of the literature on "what works". The authors find that many other prison drug treatment programs have not had such extensive guidance at start-up, and thus may have less favorable outcomes. Problems with the implementation of a program can create ongoing barriers to effective performance. Based upon a review of the literature, and their own experiences with program design, the authors discuss six common barriers to the successful implementation.

First, programs often fail to establish valid mechanisms to *identify, assess and place* inmates into appropriate treatment. Specifically, the inmate assessment process should be able to identify inmates who have the most serious need for treatment, the great risk for re-offending and who are motivated to change and assign these inmates to the most intensive treatment. This requires an assessment and assignment process that can balance treatment needs with the other demands of maintaining a safe and secure institution.

Second, *recruitment and training of staff* can also complicate program implementation. With many new prisons built in rural or remote areas, it is often difficult to find sufficient numbers of individuals in local labor markets who have experience with drug treatment. Treatment professionals from other areas may also be reluctant to relocate. High turnover in this job class can aggravate the staffing function. Strategies for addressing these staffing problems include wage incentives, training opportunities, and the use of lifers and other inmates as supplemental counselors and mentors.

Third, relations between treatment and security staff can also complicate the implementation of drug treatment programs. Security personnel may see treatment staff as peripheral to the core mission of the institution (i.e. security). Treatment staff may see security staff as indifferent or even hostile to the mission of treatment. These conflicts can lead to tensions that influence inmate responses to treatment. A key strategy for dealing with this problem is cross-training among security and treatment staff. Each should fully understand the job of the other. Moreover, training of security staff can prepare them to participate in some aspects of treatment. Lines of authority over inmates must also be made clear.

Fourth, corrections administrators should carefully consider how *sanctions* against inmates in treatment will be handled. Intensive treatment modalities such as therapeutic communities (TC's) typically have a range of internal (or "therapeutic") sanctions that can be applied to inmates who fall out of compliance with program regulations. These are often very different in nature from institutional sanctions such as misconducts. Conflicts can arise over which type of sanction should be applied to which inmates under which circumstances. Treatment and security staff must agree on how these two types of sanctions will be applied, and who will apply them.

Fifth, program developers should consider the need for *aftercare* for inmates completing the program. Many evaluations of treatment programs have found a strong link between the availability of aftercare and the success of prison-based treatment. Aftercare can refer to community-based programs, as well as to follow-up programming that may occur within the institution. While the establishment of formal, community-based aftercare programs may not be feasible for all prison treatment programs, prison treatment can emphasize the importance of aftercare to inmates in treatment and can attempt to link them to community resources that already exist. Where possible, parole practices can assist inmates in taking advantage of aftercare programs (Pennsylvania's RSAT is an example of this).

Finally, inmate motivation for treatment should be considered during program design. Inmates who are in treatment voluntarily will respond to this treatment differently than inmates who have been compelled to take treatment. Ideally, all inmates undertaking intensive treatment will be doing so voluntarily, and will be highly motivated. In practice, this is seldom the case. Thus, programs should have mechanisms in place to ensure that inmates buy into the concept of treatment, without feeling that they have been coerced. One primary strategy is to give inmates "informational control" over their treatment. Inmates should be informed of what is planned for them and why. To the extent possible, inmates should also have some input into the development of their treatment plans. This can give them a sense of ownership over their treatment, and can mitigate perfunctory compliance with the treatment regimen.

This article offers interesting suggestions about the design and implementation of intensive, prison-based drug treatment programs. The authors appear to be well qualified to speak about program design, and their discussion seems valid on its face. This article makes the case that careful attention to implementation issues can have a great payoff for the evaluation of programs.

Glenn D. Walters. 1999. "Short-Term Outcome of Inmates Participating in the Lifestyle Change Program." *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 26(3), 322-337.

**This article examines the potential of a psychological services program - the Lifestyle Changes Program - to contribute to the re-socialization of criminal offenders. The impacts of the program on post-release outcomes, and on institutional behaviors, are examined. This article provides a useful evaluation of a program developed to teach pro-social values to inmates.**

The author (a psychologist at the Federal Correctional Institution (FCI) at Schuylkill) begins by noting that prison-based psychotherapy professionals face increasing demands to evaluate and document the efficacy of their psychological services. A body of literature has developed regarding the effectiveness of these programs. Contrary to the school-of-thought that "nothing works", the literature indicates that psychological services can have positive impacts upon inmates, especially where high risk populations and criminogenic needs are targeted.

The author reports on an evaluation of a psychotherapy program in place at FCI - Schuylkill. The Lifestyle Change Program (LCP) treats crime as a dysfunctional lifestyle and attempts to effect change within inmates along three primary dimensions. First, the inmate is conditioned/empowered to see himself as someone capable of withstanding criminogenic pressures and of taking responsibility for proper social behavior. Second, the inmate is taught a variety of social skills (e.g. thinking and problem solving) needed to function both within the institution and back out in society. Third, the program works to pattern positive social behaviors and attitudes (e.g. work, school) as habits, in contrast to self-destructive habits (e.g. drug use, gambling) that may have contributed to incarceration. This program is divided into three phases, for a total program duration of seventy weeks. Programming consumes approximately one to three hours per week.

The author evaluated the impact of the LCP by forming three groups of inmates. The first group consisted of 291 inmates who completed at least one phase of the program. The second group consisted of 124 inmates who failed to complete even the first phase of the LCP. The third group (comparison) consisted of 82 inmates who volunteered for the LCP, but who were transferred or released before they could begin the program.

The author collected data on two specific types of outcomes: disciplinary outcomes and release outcomes. Disciplinary outcomes refer to the number of disciplinary reports (misconducts) received by inmates before, during and after the program. Release outcomes refer to halfway house failure, parole violation or arrest following release from incarceration. The author collected approximately five years of data.

The author found that inmates in the third (control) group had significantly higher levels of misconduct than inmates who had some experience with the program. Moreover, inmates who had more exposure to the program had slightly lower levels of misconducts. High risk inmates also tended to benefit slightly more from the program than low risk inmates.

Effects of the program on release outcomes were less clear. No significant differences between the treatment and control groups were found. High-risk inmates, however, did seem to benefit somewhat more than low risk subjects on the post-release measures.

The LCP has a significant effect on the institutional behavior of participants, but less of an effect on their eventual post-release outcomes. High-risk inmates do tend to benefit more from the program. There is also a positive, albeit weak, relationship between extent of program exposure and level of benefit. The author concludes that this program has demonstrable value for promoting positive behavior by inmates within the institution. The impact of the program upon recidivism is unclear.

This research appears to be well done, with no major methodological flaws. One area of concern may be the intensity of the program itself. The author notes that inmates typically receive only one hour of intervention in this program per week. Absent any information about other types of programs undertaken, or about aftercare, it is difficult to say whether one can actually expect substantial impacts from such a program. Significant impacts are more likely to be found with intensive, "total immersion" programs such as therapeutic communities.

It may be that a relatively low intensity intervention such as the Lifestyle Change Program cannot reasonably be expected to have a substantial impact on recidivism. Indeed, the author discusses the use of recidivism as the primary indicator of correctional program effectiveness. Regardless of the value of this program for reducing recidivism, this article does present evidence that the program has some value for controlling behavior within the institution.

Richard P. Seiter and Mark S. Fleisher. 1999. "The Responsibility Model and Teaching Prosocial Values to Inmates." <i>Corrections Management Quarterly</i> , 3(3), 57-65.
---

**This article examines the Residential Values Program, which attempts to teach pro-social values to federal inmates. The design and operation of the program are reviewed. The authors then present preliminary data on how this program has affected inmate behavior. This research provides insight into how the federal system has attempted to counter anti-social thinking and behavior among offenders.**

The authors begin by noting the shift in attitudes towards inmate treatment and rehabilitation that have affected all prison systems over the past two decades. The emphasis now is upon forcing inmates to accept personal responsibility for their offenses. This entails that they realize that their criminal behavior was wrong, that they understand how their acts have harmed others and that they learn how to think and behave in ways that are not destructive of social order. This approach to inmate treatment is referred to as the "responsibility model".

The authors discuss attempts to create programs designed to teach responsibility to inmates, focusing upon the Residential Values Program (RVP), currently in place at the Federal Correctional Institution (FCI) in Greenville, Illinois. This program began as a basic, twenty hour character-building course in 1993. It evolved into a six month, 300 hour intensive residential program.

The RVP is open to any inmate at FCI Greenville, although a screening process attempts to select inmates who are motivated to change their behavior. The program follows a modified therapeutic community model, with participants living in a separate housing unit and undergoing treatment for half of the day, interacting with the general population for the remainder of the day. The RVP focuses upon thinking and problem-solving skills, values restructuring, parenting/family skills, and life skills. There is also a wellness component, various educational seminars and other elements.

The authors worked with the federal Bureau of Prisons to design an evaluation of the RVP. The evaluation focused upon inmates' perceptions of the program, and the impact of the program upon inmate misconducts. Unfortunately, the impact of the program upon inmates' post-release behavior was not assessed in this evaluation.

Data collected from 84 program participants indicates that the inmates have a generally positive impression of the program, and are satisfied with what they have gotten from the program. They report that the program is well integrated into the institutional routine, and that other inmates are generally supportive of their involvement in it. They also indicate that they have benefited from the program, and that the program has improved their adjustment to the institution.

A review of the disciplinary records of these and other inmates indicates that the program has had a positive impact upon the institutional behavior of inmates who have taken the program. Overall misconduct rates at FCI Greenville have declined since the inception of the RVP. RVP participants also have lower misconduct rates than a matched comparison group. While the authors caution that there are many factors that contribute to institutional misconduct rates, they conclude that these findings are encouraging for the RVP.

On the whole, this study seems to be reasonably well done, although the authors allow their personal biases about inmate treatment and rehabilitation to intrude into their reporting at various points. The major drawback to this study is the absence of any exploration of how the RVP affects the post-release behavior of inmates. Given that this program is geared towards encouraging responsible social behavior on the part of offenders, a study of the community readjustment is wanting.

Kathleen J. Block. 1999. "Bringing Scouting To Prison: Programs and Challenges." *The Prison Journal*, 79(2), 269-283.

**This article reviews the operations and challenges faced by a type of prison-based parenting program not commonly studied - Scouting programs in prison. This article provides interesting insight into how these programs were established, how they currently operate, and the accomplishments and challenges associated with them.**

Scouting in prison began at the Maryland Correctional Institution for Women in 1992. The Girl Scouts Beyond Bars (GSBB) was established there with the support of the National Institute of Justice. The primary goal of the program was to promote and maintain positive relationships between girls and their incarcerated mothers through structured and unstructured visitation and activities. This model won quick recognition from the U.S. Attorney General, the media and from other quarters. Other jurisdictions visited the Maryland program seeking guidance for similar programs. Programs were subsequently established in other states.

The author surveyed the eleven known replications of the GSBB program in order to explore the extent to which the Maryland model was used, variations on the model and perceptions of program staff regarding the challenges of establishing and running such a program. Responses were received from nine other program sites. Not all sites were state prisons; some were community corrections facilities or county jails.

This survey found that all of these programs operate as public-private partnerships between a Girl Scout Council and a correctional facility. Other agencies may become involved to provide support services, such as transportation or parenting education. A typical program budget is \$15,000 to \$30,000 per annum, with funding by a mix of charitable donations and public and private grants. The Girl Scout Councils often must engage in ongoing efforts to raise money for the programs. These programs are typically staffed by Girl Scout employees, volunteers and interns, with staff support from the prisons. Transportation is provided by the Girl Scout Councils.

The programs' missions and goals tend to focus more upon service to the girls than to the mothers. The overall mission of these programs is to promote positive contact between the girls and their mothers, to develop the girls' self-esteem and school performance and to ease the reunification of the girls with their mothers when they are released from prison. Some programs also hope that exposure to the prison environment will discourage the girls from engaging in criminally deviant behaviors themselves.

The programs all have some sort of criteria for accepting girls into the program, usually the girls' age (ranging from 5 to 17 years) and residence. Some programs are limited to girls from specific regions, such as a major city, due in large part to transportation issues. The mothers must also meet certain criteria for participation, such as committing offense and remaining misconduct free. The most successful inmate recruiting strategy seems to be informing the mothers about the program at intake, using the classification process to determine the most likely candidates for participation.

These programs run a variety of activities for the girls and their mothers. Activities include in-prison troop meetings, collaborative activities (e.g. arts and crafts) and discussion groups (especially for the older girls). The Girl Scout Councils typically supplement these in-prison activities with community-based activities for the girls, such as sleepovers and fieldtrips. The incarcerated mothers also typically receive support services, such as parenting education.

Membership turnover is a problem common to these programs. Few mothers are removed from the program due to institutional misconduct. Transfers, releases and other institutional management issues contribute to turnover among program participants. Staff burnout is also commonly reported. Coordinating these programs between the community and the institution is time intensive and stressful, particularly for Girl Scout staff and volunteers who are unfamiliar or uncomfortable with the prison environment.

The author concludes that the Maryland program has been the central model for all of these Girl Scout prison programs. On the whole, the programs seem to have promoted positive contacts between girls and their incarcerated mothers, although the author acknowledges that a formal outcome evaluation is needed.

This article provides interesting background information on an innovative type of prison parenting program. It provides a good review of how these programs have been established and discusses barriers to implementation. This article should be of value to any corrections professional interested in programs to enhance the parenting skills of prison inmates.

David Shichor. 1999. "Privatizing Correctional Institutions: An Organizational Perspective." *The Prison Journal*, 79(2), 226-249.

**This article is a discussion of some of the theoretical implications of privatizing correctional facilities. This piece illustrates the structural and environmental forces within which private organizations operate, and how these impact the traditional mission of corrections. This article provides meaningful background and context that is applicable to the privatization of any public function.**

The author begins by discussing the growing interest in, and utilization of, private correctional facilities and providers. Government at all levels has been increasingly willing over the past two decades to consider private correctional options, ranging from contracting for limited, specific services within prisons to vesting control of entire facilities in private hands.

The increasing presence of private correctional providers has had significant impacts upon what many scholars refer to as the *correctional subgovernment*. This subgovernment is the confluence of political (e.g legislative), business and public administrative stakeholders who influence corrections policy making and practice. Clearly, the introduction of business interests and motivations changes the mix of forces that drive correctional decision making. Without passing judgement on the merits of prison privatization, the author points out that it is informative to examine how the organizational environment of corrections changes when private providers become key stakeholders.

The author presents an extended discussion of these organizational-environmental changes. Most notably, private organizations are characterized by much less goal ambiguity than is typically the

case for public organizations. Public corrections organizations have been shaped by centuries of debate over the proper goals of prisons; e.g. rehabilitation, punishment, containment, etc. In many respects, the goal ambiguity reflected in this debate is healthy, as it expresses the changing popular will, which is central to the regime values of our system of government.

Private organizations, conversely, typically have profit making as their dominant goal. The extent to which this goal can be made to serve the public interest is a function of the degree of oversight exercised by relevant authorities. The point is that privatization has clear implications for the pursuit of the public good.

Closely related to this point is the question of how the benefits of privatization are distributed. Privatization introduces a new set of beneficiaries (e.g. investors, financial institutions) that may operate in competition with the traditional beneficiaries of correctional systems (e.g. inmates, victims, the general public). This has clear implications for the control of correctional institutions.

The full range of organizational issues identified by this article are too complex to summarize here. This piece does make the point that the decision to privatize is attended by important organizational considerations that are related to the question of what we wish to get from correctional institutions.

Scott D. Camp. 1999. "Do Inmate Survey Data Reflect Prison Conditions? Using Surveys to Assess Prison Conditions of Confinement." *The Prison Journal*, 79(2), 250-268.

**This article reviews the potential of inmate surveys to contribute to the assessments of prisons. Actual inmate surveys are discussed to illustrate the application of such surveys to prison evaluations. Such surveys can provide useful information, but they must be carefully structured. While this article is highly technical, it does provide useful guidance to collecting data from inmates.**

The author begins by discussing various approaches to assessing differences between prisons. Such assessment is a critical and sensitive activity, as these assessments often result in competitive comparisons between institutions. Comparative exercises frequently lead to charges that the research methods were inadequate, resulting in biased findings.

Audits are commonly used to produce comparative prison assessments. Audits are often criticized, though, as being subjective paper exercises that have little relationship to the actual quality or performance of the institutions.

Audits are often supplemented by surveys/interviews with inmates regarding the conditions of confinement within the institution. These surveys typically look at a variety of elements of life in the institution, including inmate safety, quality of programs, inmate idleness, accessibility of medical care, and quality of food.

These surveys also raise suspicions among correctional authorities. Responses to these surveys are often dismissed as typical inmate "griping". Given the value of accurate and reliable information about prison conditions, it is important for correctional administrators to know how much stock they can place in inmate survey data. Unfortunately, little formal research has been done on the reliability and validity of inmate surveys.

The author attempts to remedy this research deficit by examining the data collected on federal inmates through the 1997 Inmate Survey undertaken by the federal Bureau of Prisons and the Bureau of Justice Statistics. This survey queried over four thousand federal inmates 32 different prisons about the conditions of their confinement.

What is significant about this article is not the actual findings about prison conditions (which are of course specific to those institutions at that time period), but rather the author's analysis of the validity of the data. Based upon complex statistical analysis, the author concluded that the 1997 Inmate Survey did produce findings about prison conditions that could not be explained away simply as differences in individual inmates' perceptions about prison life. Rather, this survey data does seem to reveal genuine differences between the prisons themselves, and thus is a reasonably accurate tool for the assessment of institutional quality and performance.

The author concludes that these types of surveys, if done properly and if accompanied by appropriate statistical controls, can yield information that is reliable and accurate. Such surveys should not be used as the sole indicator of institutional performance, but they can contribute to a comprehensive strategy of institutional assessment and evaluation. While this article is highly technical, it does provide some guidance to the measurement of inmate perceptions of their conditions of confinement.

### **Book Review**

Alan T. Harlan, ed. 1996. *Choosing Correctional Options that Work: Defining the Demand and Evaluating the Supply*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. 275 pp.

Reviewed by Melissa Swauger.

This book was written in response to a demand by criminal justice professionals, policymakers, and the public, for information about corrections options that work. The book has two purposes. The first is to clarify the meaning of "demand"- describing effectiveness, efficiency, and fairness

concerns that are inherent in the search for "what works." The second is to respond more effectively to the demand for corrections options that work, in three areas: 1) providing critical reviews of relevant theory and empirical evidence regarding what works, 2) intervention and sanctioning options, and 3) program implementation approaches. By clarifying the meaning of the demand and establishing a baseline of information derived from past attempts to supply these demands, the goal is to improve the odds that information given to key decision-makers will enable them to choose corrections options that work.

*Choosing Correctional Options* is divided into eight chapters. **Chapter 1, Structuring the Inquiry**, defines the term "options that work." The author explores how differing criminological philosophies (retribution, utilitarianism, etc.) result in different strategies for correctional options. Furthermore, the various disciplines with the corrections profession (budget, program, custodial staff) approach "options that work" with different ideas and interests. Regardless of philosophy or interest, decision-makers and program managers must be supplied with information that will enable them to make better decisions. It is an important challenge in correctional research and evaluation to make research more user-friendly for decision-makers who will ultimately choose correctional options. This chapter is useful for all criminal justice professionals in that it clearly defines the term demand (the need for options that work) and it clearly explains how researchers should use their work to help other corrections professionals make decisions.

**Chapter 2, Risk-Needs Assessment and Treatment**, examines risk assessment for release and reintegration of offenders into the community. The author discusses two components of releasing and reintegrating offenders: "making sound release decisions," and "effective treatment programming." Assessment tools have frequently been used to determine the release and reintegration of offenders. The author refers to these tools as "generational assessment tools." Today we use the "third generation assessment." This type of assessment tool links the assessment process to rehabilitation. As assessment tools continue to advance, more emphasis is being placed on the individual, specifically, his/her criminogenic needs. If criminogenic needs are not targeted, then reductions in recidivism, and therefore crime, are not likely. Chapter Two is useful for all criminal justice professionals because it emphasizes the need to recognize the criminogenic needs of offenders and the necessity for individualized treatment. The chapter is specifically useful for psychologists, psychiatrists, therapists, caseworkers, or other professionals who assess and treat offenders.

**Chapter 3, Risk Prediction in Criminal Justice**, describes ideal statistical risk prediction methods as easy to use and bias free. The accuracy and validity of statistical methods, however, are often questionable. It is important to remember that researchers should use the most appropriate, rather than the easiest, analytic methods. The author warns that studies should be based on theory and not data availability, all risk assessments should be validated, and risk prediction tools may not always be universal. The chapter is useful for those individuals who influence release and reintegration decisions.

**Chapter 4, Control in the Community**, explores the need for, and acceptance of, community

corrections. Intermediate sanctioning is a popular correctional tool because it satisfies the needs of policymakers and the public and it saves money while keeping people safe. Community corrections is described as a reform in corrections. The authors argue that reforms are not based on whether they work, but whether they mesh with political and organization interests. The chapter examines the effectiveness of specific community programs including intensive supervision, home confinement and electronic monitoring, drug testing, and boot camps. The authors explain the lack of valid research in community corrections makes for difficulty in providing definitive answers about the effectiveness of these programs. However, the authors conclude that community corrections will not resolve the problems of prison overcrowding or lack of funding in the criminal justice system. Therefore, intermediate sanctions are not any more effective than regular probation or prison. The chapter is useful for all criminal justice professionals, specifically, those exploring the pros and cons of community corrections and the effectiveness of specific community corrections programs.

**Chapter 5, The Principles of Effective Intervention with Offenders**, identifies eight principles of effective intervention. The principles are: 1) services should be intensive and behavioral in nature, 2) behavioral programs should target the criminogenic needs of high-risk offenders, 3) characteristics of offenders, therapists, and programs should be matched, 4) program contingencies and behavioral strategies should be enforced in a firm but fair manner, 5) therapists should be trained to relate to offenders interpersonally and in a constructive manner, 6) programs should be designed to disrupt the delinquency network; 7) relapse prevention strategies should be provided, 8) a high level of advocacy brokerage should be offered. This chapter is specifically useful for correctional program designers, implementers, directors, and staff.

**Chapter 6, Programmatic and Nonprogrammatic Aspects of Successful Intervention**, is a review of nine meta-analyses and 23 literature reviews on intervention programs, which produced one of the most inclusive analyses of correction intervention programs ever completed. The authors found the programs with the most credibility were those that used a combination of intervention techniques. Furthermore, they found positive staff characteristics in reducing recidivism include interpersonal sensitivity, specific treatment effects, and a positive relationship between caseworker and client. Effective recidivism reduction also depends on the understanding of offender differences and the offender's regard for the setting in which treatment is given. For corrections research to advance, a greater emphasis must be placed on multiple features analysis which examines programs across operational, staff, and offender variables. The chapter can be used by program designers, managers, and staff. The chapter is most useful for those professionals who research and evaluation intervention programs.

**Chapter 7, Developing Community Corrections**, focuses on maximizing the potential of a policy or program because, the authors say, success is ultimately determined by implementation. The authors discuss six correlates of successful implementation. They include: 1) sincere motivation at initiation, 2) support from top leadership, 3) staff competence, 4) a benefit-cost surplus, 5) clarity of goals and procedures, and 6) clear lines of authority. The authors explain that the conditions listed above can be realized if there is a close fit between a program or policy and its policy environment and if there is commitment to the innovation at all levels. Other factors that influence the success of

program implementation include matching offenders with the right programs, communicating the goals of the program, feedback from decision-makers and program participants, and obtaining the necessary resources. The chapter can be used by policy and program analysts, implementers, directors, and staff.

**Chapter 8, Improving Corrections Policy: The importance of researchers and practitioners working together**, emphasizes that improvements in corrections policy and practice are more likely to emerge if researchers and practitioners work more closely together. Currently, it is public opinion that drives corrections policy. Professional leadership can influence public opinion, but there has to be a message, a plan, and a policy that is clearly articulated and readily understood. Researchers, policymakers, and practitioners must cooperate with one another, as well as with funding agencies, to share information, help decision-makers understand and apply information, conduct higher quality corrections research, and help program administrators understand more about conducting research. This chapter is useful for all criminal justice professionals.

*Choosing Corrections Options that Work* is valuable reading for any one interested in corrections. Harland's book provides a wealth of information about corrections research, correctional intervention and sanctioning, and program design and implementation. The authors of each of the chapters seek to provide a better understanding of how corrections research findings can be made more user-friendly for decision-makers and other corrections professionals. The book can be used as a resource by researchers, community corrections practitioners, program designers, implementers, analysts, and/or other criminal justice professionals.