

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
Department of Corrections
Bureau of Planning, Research, Statistics and Grants
Phone: (717) 214-8959

July 8, 2008

SUBJECT: *Research in Review*

TO: Executive Staff
 Superintendents
 Other Readers



FROM: Gary Zajac, Ph.D.
 Chief of Research and Evaluation

 Kristofer Bret Bucklen
 Chief of Projections and Population Statistics

Enclosed please find Volume 11, Number 2 of *Research in Review* (RIR). This issue presents four article reviews dealing with various topics including gender responsive programming, community corrections evaluation and the impact of the principles of effective offender intervention, family structure and criminality and mentoring programs.

The first two reviews were prepared by Jacqueline Young, a Research and Evaluation Analyst within PRSG. The third review was prepared by Lisa Wingard, a Research and Evaluation Analyst within PRSG. The final review was prepared by David Betts, who was assigned to PRSG as a Pennsylvania Management Associate during 2007-2008. We greatly appreciate their ongoing contributions to RIR.

Upcoming issues of Volume 11 will continue to present findings from the ongoing study of parole violators and parole successes conducted by Bret Bucklen, as well as summaries of ongoing Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) research being conducted by Jesse Zortman. RIR will also continue with article reviews and briefing papers on topics relevant to corrections, as well as discussing findings from PADOE evaluation studies as they are completed.

As always, we welcome your feedback on RIR. We also welcome your suggestions for specific topical areas for future issues. While we cannot promise that we can produce an issue in response to all suggestions offered, we are very much interested in knowing what questions and topics are most interesting to our readers.

Thank you for your ongoing interest in *Research in Review*.

Research in Review

Office of Planning, Research, Statistics and Grants

Editors: Gary Zajac and Kristofer Bret Bucklen (717)214-8959

Summary and Major Findings of Articles Reviewed

Dana Jones Hubbard, et al. 2008. "Reconciling the Differences Between the 'Gender-Responsive' and the 'What Works' Literatures to Improve Services for Girls." *Crime & Delinquency*, 54(2), 225-258. Page 2

This article attempts to reconcile two often conflicting schools of thought surrounding the rehabilitation of female offenders – the research-oriented "What Works" school and the relational-oriented "Gender Responsive" school. This article evaluates the strengths and weaknesses of each perspective and makes a persuasive argument that correctional practice can benefit from a blend of the two.

Christopher T. Lowenkamp, et al. 2006. "Does Correctional Program Quality Really Matter? The Impact of Adhering to the Principles of Effective Intervention?" *Criminology & Public Policy*, 5(3), 575-594. Page 4

This article reports on the findings of an evaluation of the Ohio Halfway House system, focusing specifically on the impact of correctional program integrity on outcomes. This study finds that overall, programs that adhered more closely to these principles were more likely to show reductions in recidivism than programs that did not.

Robert Apel, et al. 2008. "On the Relationship Between Family Structure and Antisocial Behavior: Parental Cohabitation and Blended Households." *Criminology*, 46(1), 35-70. Page 7

This complex article presents a detailed examination of the relationship between family structure and delinquency. Most notably, this research adopts more multiplex definitions of "family" than is commonly found in such research and highlights the importance at investigating the impact of multiple family types.

Darrick Joliffe, et al. 2007. *A Rapid Evidence Assessment of the Impact of Mentoring on Reoffending: A Summary*. British Home Office On-Line Report. Page 9

This report presents a review of the research on mentoring programs for offenders, summarizing the results of 18 evaluations (mostly U.S. studies). This review finds mixed evidence for mentoring programs. While some evaluations found recidivism reductions of 11%, the highest quality studies found no effects. Even where effective, mentoring must be part of a larger strategy of offender intervention that provides a continuum of mentoring services to offenders. By themselves, mentoring programs had relatively weak and short-lived effects.

Dana Jones Hubbard and Betsy Matthews. 2008. "Reconciling the Differences Between the 'Gender-Responsive' and the 'What Works' Literatures to Improve Services for Girls." *Crime & Delinquency*, 54(2), 225-258.

While statistics show that local, state, and federal inmates are overwhelmingly male, studies over the last few years suggest that the percentage of incarcerated females is increasing. Such an increase, combined with statistics showing that crimes by women are progressively more violent, has renewed interest in the discussion surrounding gender-specific rehabilitation programming. In response to these trends, Hubbard and Matthews present an extensive review of the "what works" and "gender-responsive" literature and discuss which theories, or combination of theories, appear most promising for practitioners involved with female juvenile offenders. While both approaches are seemingly disparate in their fundamental principles, the authors strive to identify areas of common ground.

This article provides a comprehensive discussion about each theory's fundamental foundation, program goals, consideration of risk, assessment and classification practices, "criminogenic" needs and therapeutic approaches. Based on this discussion, Hubbard and Matthews provide insight as to whether "irreconcilable differences" exist between these two schools of thought. Guiding their discussion are three key questions:

- How different are the risks/needs of boys and girls in the juvenile justice system?
- Are current trends in risk assessment and classification appropriate for girls?
- What is the most appropriate therapeutic approach for girls?

The authors very clearly acknowledge the importance of understanding what is already known, and not known, about the risks and needs of girls and identifying specific risk factors for both boys and girls. In drawing findings from several key studies, they conclude overall that additional research is needed to understand the antisocial behaviors of girls, specifically more methodologically appropriate and longitudinal research. Hubbard and Matthews point out that most studies related to risk assessment rely on factors that have been found to predict boys' delinquency, and there may be other variables not yet considered that better predict girls' delinquency. They additionally note that most studies related to risk factors for boys and girls tend to be cross-sectional studies. While these are valuable in identifying statistically significant relationships between specific risk factors and delinquency, they are limited in explaining why these relationships exist. A final limitation of recent studies is their concentration on youth already involved in the correctional system. The results, therefore, apply to inmates, but may not be applicable to the general population.

Despite these research limitations, Hubbard and Matthews are still able to point to findings that support both what works and gender-responsive arguments. Specifically, research supporting the what works philosophy indicates that social cognitive problems result in higher rates of crime and violence among both boys and girls. As a complement to these findings, gender-responsive studies have shown that these social cognitive problems are in fact different for boys and girls and thus

differentially impact antisocial behaviors. For girls, examples of these behavioral differences include girls having poor impulse control, stronger moral evaluations of behavior, greater empathy, a higher tendency toward guilt, and a need for social acceptance. While girls need the same cognitive behavioral treatment as boys, treatment may be complemented by gender specific approaches.

Based on these findings, the authors conclude that research does indeed support both arguments while pointing to similarities and differences between delinquency factors of boys and girls. Hubbard and Matthews argue that gender-specific factors such as depression may intensify girls' delinquency, but universal factors like antisocial behavior may amplify delinquent behavior and encourage it to continue. Given this example, services focused exclusively on gender-specific factors like self-esteem and mental health issues may help delinquent girls improve their lifestyles, but will not reduce recidivism if the major risk factors shared by boys and girls are not addressed.

Hubbard and Matthews also discuss whether current trends in risk assessment and classification are appropriate for girls. The what works and gender-responsive groups both agree that 1) overclassifying and overtreating offenders, regardless of sex, causes harm; and 2) community-based rather than prison-based services are preferable and more effective. However, the real contention exists over the use of actuarial risk assessment instruments, particularly in the gender-responsive group's desire for gender-specific assessment tools. However, as Hubbard and Matthews emphasize, this is one area where evidence suggests that gender may not be a factor—as evidenced by recent studies showing that risk instruments are equally effective in predicting both male and female delinquency. The authors also contend that current risk instruments address the concerns of each group by reducing both gender bias (gender-responsive concern) and overclassification (concern of both groups). Hubbard and Matthews suggest that using a standard risk assessment in conjunction with other gender-specific practices (i.e. assessing other problem areas specific to girls, determining strengths/assets and conducting in-depth intake interviews) will address gender-responsive concerns.

Given the results offered by recent studies, what is the most appropriate therapeutic approach for girls? While the authors acknowledge that much work remains to be done on this question, they are able to craft a response that addresses the concerns of both what works and gender-responsive proponents. In drawing from recent evidence, they generally conclude that the best approach derives from both camps—the relational model from the gender-responsive group and the cognitive-behavioral model from the what works group. In combining these approaches, Hubbard and Matthews propose a specific therapeutic approach for girls that includes key concepts from each body of literature. The basis of the approach involves cognitive-behavioral interventions that incorporate the relational aspects that gender-responsive advocates emphasize.

The relational model stresses the development of a “helping alliance,” which addresses the gender-responsive group's concern with girls needing healthy relationships. Specifically, an effective therapeutic alliance includes three elements: agreement on the goals of intervention, collaboration between the client and “change agent” on how to reach therapeutic goals, and a relationship that helps the client feel comfortable through self-examination exercises and overall development. The guiding belief is that by surrounding girls with positive and healthy relationship structures, they will then be “insulated” from situations that would otherwise lead to risky behavior.

Hubbard and Matthews also suggest that cognitive-behavioral approaches are especially applicable to girls. This suggestion is based on studies showing that cognitive approaches have improved behaviors among girls and have been effective in cases involving adolescent girls, particularly those with depression and eating disorders. However, to be effective, Hubbard and Matthews suggest some modification to cognitive-behavioral approaches as applied to girls, which supports the responsivity principle. Modifications include incorporating “support, safety, and intimacy” in groups; and focusing on the cognitive issues that are specific to girls, namely self-degrading actions and internalizing behaviors. Effective practices may also include family, school-based, and peer interventions that create healthy relationships, reverse negative beliefs, and establish closer supervision of habits or behaviors.

While Hubbard and Matthews supply a thorough review of the literature while proposing an intervention approach based on both principles, they do acknowledge that additional research is needed to identify the pathway from childhood to delinquency for girls and, most importantly, to combine both approaches into effective treatment practices. Also of note is how the authors emphasize that the findings from gender-responsive and what works literature are in fact complementary, not competitive. Hubbard and Matthews point to key contributions on both sides of the fence. The gender-responsive literature reminds us that a girl’s “social context” affects delinquency and that there are differences between boys and girls in terms of socialization and development. The what works literature provides a strong foundation for program development that has been transformed into applicable practices in a variety of correctional settings. Combining the features of both approaches could result in valuable contributions for girls’ programming overall.

Christopher T. Lowenkamp, Edward J. Latessa and Paula Smith. 2006. “Does Correctional Program Quality Really Matter? The Impact of Adhering to the Principles of Effective Intervention.” *Criminology & Public Policy*, 5(3), 575-594.

Recent statistics indicate that the number of offenders under community supervision is increasing, as is the number of offenders violating probation and parole requirements. Under community supervision, many offenders commit new crimes, continue substance abuse, fail to pay fines, and fall short of meeting other conditions of community release. Given these recent data and other evidence that some community supervision programs do not meet their intended outcomes, what more can be done to rehabilitate offenders through community-based programs? To begin addressing this question, Lowenkamp, Latessa and Smith examined the relationship between the Correctional Program Assessment Inventory (CPAI) and outcomes of halfway house programs in Ohio. The authors used the following research question to guide the study: Does a relationship exist between program integrity and program effectiveness?

Lowenkamp, Latessa and Smith used program integrity and offender data from 38 halfway house (HWH) programs in Ohio as the basis for this study. Researchers trained in the application of the

CPAI collected data on program integrity via program director interviews, reviews of relevant program materials and program integrity surveys completed by program staff. Not all items on the CPAI were scored primarily because multiple sources of data were not available for each program.

The researchers measured program effectiveness by comparing the recidivism rates of treatment and comparison groups for each program. Recidivism was defined as a return to an Ohio Correctional Facility for any reason (i.e. technical violation or new arrest). The researchers used advanced statistical techniques (e.g. logged odds ratios) to measure program effectiveness, which they found to be the best measure when analyzing two distinct groups (treatment and control/comparison) and outcomes (success and failure). Program integrity was measured using a shorter version of the CPAI, measures developed from staff survey responses, and community corrections database information from the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction. These measures included program implementation, client pre-service assessment, program characteristics and evaluation.

The study sample included all Community Corrections Act-funded programs (N = 38) in Ohio providing residential services to state parolees through a HWH. The treatment group consisted of offenders served by the sample programs with a release date during fiscal year 1999 and who entered a HWH operated by the State Parole Board (N = 3,237). The comparison group was comprised of parolees/post-releasees under parole supervision who were not placed in the HWH programs (N = 3,237). The comparison group was matched with and compared to the treatment group using three comparison factors: county of conviction, sex and risk level. Demographically, the control and comparison groups were similar in terms of race and gender but differed in age, as the comparison group's mean age was three years older. Although the groups differed in terms of prior arrest and incarceration, most subjects had previous criminal justice system contact.

To determine treatment effect for each program, the researchers calculated logged odds ratios for all program participants and their comparison cases; as well as for offenders who successfully completed the programs and their respective comparison cases. The first analysis took into account all program participants, including both successful completions and unsuccessful terminations, revealing that for 73% of the programs, the comparison group recidivated at lower or equal rates than the treatment group. This equated to a recidivism rate for the treatment group that is 10% higher than the comparison group. The researchers also calculated effect sizes for only those subjects who successfully completed, which showed that 61% of the programs were associated with treatment effects favoring the treatment group. For successful completers, the mean logged odds ratio showed that the recidivism rate for the treatment group is about 4% lower than that of the comparison group. As shown in these data, most programs did not show positive results when taking all program participants under consideration. However, in reviewing only successful completers, the study found that programs are generally associated with a reduction in recidivism, suggesting that treatment effect is linked to completion status.

The second phase of the analysis evaluated the relationship between program integrity and treatment outcomes. Similar to the first analysis, treatment outcomes were first determined for all subjects (successful completions and unsuccessful terminations combined) and the successful completions

alone. For all subjects, the total CPAI score correlates with all outcome measures (i.e. new offense, technical violation, return to prison), although only two CPAI subcomponents (program implementation and pre-service client assessment) are correlated with all three outcome measures. When analyzing successful completions only, the total CPAI score does not significantly correlate with new offenses or technical violations, but is associated with return to prison. Only one subcomponent, program implementation, is correlated with any outcome measures (technical violation and return to prison).

The third phase of the analysis focused on how programs can be grouped by their CPAI scores and whether these groupings have practical value. The researchers determined the weighted average treatment effect for each group (successful terminations only), and then converted the logged odds ratio into a percentage change in recidivism. These were compared to the CPAI categories for unsatisfactory (0% to 49%), satisfactory but needs improvement (50% to 59%), satisfactory (60% to 69%), and very satisfactory (70% or higher) programs. The majority of programs fell into the unsatisfactory category, which included 24 out of the 38 programs (68%) under review. Noteworthy is that most programs reviewed by CPAI assessment protocols receive scores of 50% or lower. In this specific study, one program was rated satisfactory and 13 (35%) were rated satisfactory but needs improvement. The “unsatisfactory” programs averaged a 1.7% recidivism reduction; the satisfactory but needs improvement programs averaged a 8.1% recidivism reduction, and the one satisfactory program showed a 22% reduction in recidivism.

Although this research presents useful information about program integrity and effectiveness, it has several limitations to take into consideration. These limitations include a small sample size that is limited by gender (only male offenders), geography (only Ohio programs), and prison (offenders only released from a state prison). In addition, the subjects were released in 1999, but the program integrity data were collected in 2002. As mentioned previously, the researchers were unable to collect enough data to score the entire CPAI instrument, which presented some limitations, and using a longer follow-up period beyond two years (the amount used in this study) may have produced different results.

Despite these limitations, however, the research reveals important findings for correctional policy and halfway house/residential programming. In terms of policy implications, the research shows that program integrity is measurable, and it can be used to predict program effectiveness. This study also shows that program assessments can reveal problem areas which, if addressed, can increase program effectiveness. In addition, the authors suggest that program financial support should be based, at least partly, on program integrity and that these findings may help agencies, policymakers and funders determine which programs are most likely to provide the desired impacts on recidivism.

Although the study covers considerable territory related to program integrity, there are opportunities for further research. This primarily includes continuing to explore the connection between program integrity and program effectiveness. Additional research related to program integrity will help practitioners develop reasonable correctional policies for community-based programs and, by applying quality programs, practitioners can provide more effective and economical programs to offenders that result in long-term behavioral changes.

Editors' Note: The research reported on here contributed to the development of the Correctional Program Checklist (CPC), which allows for greater correlation between program score and recidivism outcomes. Every item in the CPC is correlated with outcome. The authors of this study are presently conducting a comprehensive CPC assessment on core institutional treatment programs within the PADOC. Moreover, these researchers are also completing a replication of the Ohio HWH study here. Future issues of RIR will report on the results.

Robert Apel and Catherine Kaukinen. 2008. "On the Relationship Between Family Structure and Antisocial Behavior: Parental Cohabitation and Blended Households." *Criminology*, 46(1), 35-70.

Previous research on antisocial behavior in youths and its relationship to the youth's family structure has traditionally compared intact versus nonintact family structures. This research has shown that youths from nonintact homes had a higher prevalence of delinquency and antisocial behavior than those who came from intact families. Nonetheless, this two-fold focus is not sufficient. More recent studies have used a more complex approach, for example creating analytical groups based on the gender of the custodial parent or on the number of biological parents present in the home.

To date, these studies have focused solely on the gender of the parent with which the youth primarily resides; this approach reveals that youths who reside with their biological father are more likely to display antisocial behavior followed by those who reside with a step-father/mother and then by those who reside in single mother households. Youths who resided with one biological parent and a step-parent were closest to married, two biological parent households in prevalence of antisocial behavior.

The question of married versus cohabitating parents has also been recently addressed by researchers. Previous research had failed to take into consideration the difference and/or stability of married couples compared to cohabitating couples. Recent research taking this into account has found that children who lived with cohabitating families (both biological and step parent families) demonstrated more antisocial behavior and related problems in school compared to children who resided with a two-parent married family, biological or step.

The authors argue that categorizing families as married versus unmarried is too simplistic to address the extreme diversity of modern family structures. A rigorous investigation of family structure and antisocial behavior in youth requires a comparison of blended versus traditional nuclear families. This approach takes into account that a married step-parent family may also include step-brothers/sisters, which further complicate family dynamics and structure; this is usually referred to as a blended family. In other words, the family structure may be nuclear for one child in the household but have one biological and one step-parent present for another child in the same household. Most previous studies have not taken this into account. The primary issue with these previous studies is a measurement problem in that these studies typically collect data at the individual level instead of at the household level. The authors of this piece were aware of no existing study that used household-based measures to account for the concept of blended versus

traditional nuclear family structure.

Monitoring of youth's behavior by parents/guardians has also been identified as a key component in predicting antisocial behavior. Some suggest that this is primarily linked to single parents not being able to provide the required amount of supervision needed to deter antisocial behavior and monitor peer influences. Other researchers have directed attention to the impact of economic conditions on antisocial behavior in youths. School performance and association with antisocial peers have also been found to predict delinquency among youth. This study included measures of all of these factors as controlling variables in their primary investigation of family structure and its relationship to antisocial behavior in youths.

For this study, the authors used data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1997 (NLSY97). They excluded youths who were 18 years or older, had missing data on family structure and were lost to attrition at the second wave. This left a primary study sample of 8,330, or 92.7% of the original sample group. Again, the principal research objective was to investigate the interplay between family structure and antisocial behavior.

The outcome variable of primary focus in this study was antisocial behavior, which was assessed via a 24 item self-reported questionnaire pertaining to problem behaviors. Responses were coded as either engaging or not engaging in antisocial behavior. Findings revealed that 70% of youths surveyed had engaged in at least one of the 24 antisocial behaviors and over one third had engaged in at least 1 of the 18 listed delinquent behaviors. The most prevalent antisocial behavior was substance abuse (over 50%) followed by minor property crimes (just under 25%).

The main predictor variable explored in their models was family structure. This was broken down into thirteen categories: 1) two biological parents in a nuclear family, 2) two biological parents in a blended family, 3) two biological parents in a cohabiting family, 4) biological mother and stepfather, 5) biological mother and cohabitating partner, 6) biological mother only, 7) biological father and stepmother, 8) biological father and cohabiting partner, 9) biological father only, 10) grandparent(s), 11) other older relative(s), 12) adoptive or foster parent(s) or 13) other living situation. When applied to the NLSY97 study, 46.3% of the sample group fell into the two biological parents in a nuclear family category. Another 26.2% lived with one biological parent, 13.1% resided in a step family situation and 2.6% lived in a cohabitating household. Of those youths who resided with one biological parent only, 87.4% remained with the mother.

Of these categories, those youths who resided with two biological parents were the least likely to engage in antisocial behavior. Youths who resided with only one biological parent engaged in at least 2.92 different antisocial behaviors compared to 1.98 among youths in nuclear families. Furthermore, of the single parent families, children who resided with the biological father only engaged in an average of 3.12 antisocial behaviors compared to 2.88 among those who resided with the biological mother only. The most at-risk group were youths who resided with the biological father and a stepparent; they engaged in 3.35 antisocial behaviors compared with an average of 2.43 for the entire sample group. However, when full statistical models were included, accounting for demographic characteristics, residential and family environmental factors, school

performance/engagement, peer affiliation and prior behavior, the most at risk group were youths residing in adoptive/foster living situations followed by youths residing with the biological father and a cohabiting stepfamily and youths residing with a biological mother and a cohabiting stepfamily.

Apel and Kaukinen also identified some key areas of limitation in their study. First, this study counted parents who married during a pregnancy as residing in nuclear families. However, there has been no research to determine if youths conceived during a cohabiting period are equivalent to those who are born within a marriage. Secondly, this study did not take into account parents who were in a second marriage but had no children from their first marriages; this type of situation may require future researchers to break the nuclear family into two categories, first marriage nuclear families and second marriage nuclear families. Finally, this study presumes that the living situation of the youths investigated is static; we know that this is frequently not the case.

Darrick Joliffe and David P. Farrington. 2007. *A Rapid Evidence Assessment of the Impact of Mentoring on Re-offending: A Summary*. British Home Office Online Report.

<http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs07/rdsolr1107.pdf>

The British Home Office is the agency responsible for the administration of the criminal justice system in the United Kingdom. Among other duties, they conduct and sponsor research on a variety of criminological topics. In 2007, the Home Office published on line the results of a meta-analysis of 18 mentoring studies. The purpose of this analysis was to assess the level of effectiveness mentoring plays in reducing recidivism. Broadly defined, mentoring is a one-to-one relationship between individuals in which the mentor guides, encourages, teaches and, when necessary, corrects the “mentee”. The general feature of all mentoring programs is the contact of a less experienced or at-risk individual with a positive role model. While the mentor tends to be older, what is required is that the mentor possess a basic level of competency with a pro-social lifestyle. The mentor, above all, must be willing to invest the time and talent necessary to perform a role in the life of the mentee.

The tradition of mentoring, while new to the field of criminal justice, has precedent in many cultural and social contexts. The “sponsor-mentee” relationship in most twelve-step recovery programs guides a novice in the ways of sobriety. A “big-brother” or “big-sister” can be an effective adult role model for juveniles lacking in sound family structures. Historically, the “master-apprentice” dynamics in guilds, higher education and spiritual advancement have proven to be a valuable means of preserving cultural, social and scientific heritage. The Home Office study notes the two major tools at the mentor’s disposal: immediate assistance that provides tangible, day-to-day support (e.g. housing assistance, transportation), and longer term support that is oriented more towards deeper lifestyle issues (e.g. modeling pro-social behavior). The effectiveness of the mentor-mentee relationship often depends upon shared cultural, ethnic, and gender histories. While mentors may receive training in communication and agency expectations, the mentor also needs to have certain

interpersonal skills such as patience, confidence, self-awareness, a sense of proper boundaries, humor, etc.

The report utilized a rapid evidence assessment (REA) to summarize a range of studies on mentoring. Choosing to use a REA offered a trade off. Its use provided for a relatively speedy and rigorous synthesis of data at the same level of detail as the original reports. But the Home Office, in using the REA format to save time, was restricted to analysis of published studies in English. Thus, significant studies done in foreign languages or in less academically rigorous settings were not included. Despite the report's limitations, the results provide some evidence on the effectiveness of mentoring in reducing recidivism.

Of the 18 studies, 7 were shown to have had a statistically significant impact on recidivism. Mentoring was shown to have reduced recidivism between 4% and 11%. Most of these findings, however, were attributable to lower quality studies. The high quality studies included in this review did not find any impact on recidivism by mentoring programs. The most effective mentoring programs were those where the mentor and mentee met at least per week and spent an appreciable amount of time together at each meeting. Perhaps most importantly, to be effective, mentoring had to be part of a larger system of interventions delivered to an offender, such as cognitive-behavioral therapy or education and employment programs. Mentoring programs by themselves did not seem to have much of an impact. Moreover, the effects of mentoring programs seem to wear off when active program participation ends; there did not seem to be lasting effects. The results also suggested that mentoring had a greater impact on recidivism for those arrested by the police as opposed to populations that are only at risk by virtue of self-evident criminogenic factors. While this may be attributable to the more intense and frequent mentor-mentee contact found in criminal justice situations, the possibility of mentoring playing a greater role in all comprehensive treatment programs seems promising.

One of the key Principles of Effective Offender Intervention involves the targeting of criminogenic needs. That is to say, to target those factors that can be changed. The mentor is uniquely positioned to influence most of these risk factors. For juveniles especially, a mentor can have an impact on family conflict, substance use, the development of positive peer relations and the cultivation of pro-social behaviors. The value of mentoring flows from the mentor's ability to simultaneously touch multiple dimensions of personal growth. The complexity of human development and the demands of socialization require a lifetime of social networking. Self-regulation and self-control are as much "caught" from associates (e.g. mentors) as "taught" by authority figures. For those lacking a history of either healthy associations or quality role-models due to circumstances of birth or choice, a mentor can be the "teacher" and "carrier" of what has been lacking.