

AN INTENSIVE SUPERVISION PROGRAM THAT WORKED: SERVICE DELIVERY, PROFESSIONAL ORIENTATION, AND ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORTIVENESS

MARIO A. PAPAROZZI

University of North Carolina–Pembroke

PAUL GENDREAU

University of New Brunswick

This study examined the effect of treatment services, organizational supportiveness, and parole officer orientation on parolee recidivism. The sample consisted of 240 parolees enrolled in an intensive surveillance supervision program and 240 parolees undergoing traditional parole supervision. The participants were high-risk/high-need parolees. Three measures of parolee recidivism were used: (a) technical parole violation, (b) new conviction, and (c) revocation. These measures were examined by level of treatment services, organizational supportiveness, and the law enforcement/treatment orientation of intensive surveillance supervision program parole officers of which there were three classifications: (a) law enforcement, (b) balanced, and (c) social casework. The data support the view that intensive supervision programs that (a) provide more treatment to higher risk offenders, (b) employ parole officers with balanced law enforcement/social casework orientations, and (c) are implemented in supportive organizational environments may reduce recidivism from 10% to 30% depending on the comparisons being made.

Keywords: *parole; probation; community corrections; recidivism; intensive supervision; professional orientation; casework*

The provision of rehabilitative services in probation and parole settings for the purposes of integrating offenders into society as law-abiding citizens has a fascinating history. About the turn of the past century, the emerging wisdom among the so-called new penologists was that the rational and progressive approach to crime control was to pursue a rehabilitative agenda; in other words, individualized treatment would be the vehicle by which successful reintegration into society would be achieved (Cullen & Gendreau,

2000, 2001). Much of the thinking in that era focused on prisons as the primary locus of offender-based treatment services; however, tentative suggestions were already being advanced that treatment should also take place in aftercare settings (Healy, 1915). Subsequently, the notion that parole and probation (P/P) activities could also play a prominent role in offender rehabilitation was advanced by influential scholars such as Edwin Sutherland (1939) who asserted that probation, "which assists the offender . . . to regain contacts with normal groups" (p. 595), was a policy that should be vigorously pursued. For the better part of the 20th century, the rehabilitative ideal dominated thinking in the field of corrections (e.g., Task Force on Corrections, 1967; Toby, 1964). Punishment, on the other hand, was considered a barbaric alternative and of little utility (see Menninger, 1968).

By the 1960s, P/P services were well established in several Western countries. The professionalization of P/P activities became intimately linked with psychotherapeutic models emphasizing casework practices (see *Probation Journal*, 1961 edition). Furthermore, one of the axioms of the time was that scientific evidence should drive governmental policies whenever possible (Cullen & Gendreau, 2001). Thereupon, a number of evaluations of the efficacy of treatment services began to appear in the literature. Programs that were grounded in various behavioral approaches, and which focused on the quality of interpersonal relationships, produced meaningful reductions in recidivism (e.g. 20% to 50%) and generated marked increases in employment and educational skills for program participants (cf., Ross & Gendreau, 1980). Reports of successful treatment services in correctional programming, including P/P, significantly diminished in frequency from the mid-1970s to the late 1980s (e.g., Davidson, Redner, Blakely, Mitchell, & Emshoff, 1987; Ross, Fabiano, & Eweles, 1988), and by 1990, they had all but disappeared. The reasons for the demise of the rehabilitative model in corrections, particularly in the United States,¹ have been thoroughly documented and do not bear repeating (Cullen & Gendreau, 1989, 2000; Gendreau, Goggin, & Fulton, 2000). Suffice it to say, the confluence of complex political and social events and professional issues in criminal justice led to a denigration of the rehabilitative ideal (Cullen & Gendreau, 2001).

The impact of the abandonment of rehabilitation in the corrections profession was expansive. It was during this period that debates emerged regarding the efficacy of grounding the programs, policies, and procedures of P/P in rehabilitating offenders as opposed to containing or punishing them. In the final analysis, the P/P profession in the United States—for the first time in its professional history and antithetical to its robust philosophical roots in offender rehabilitation—distanced itself from a social casework identity

(Clear & Rungay, 1992) in favor of a get-tough orientation toward supervision.² This shift in roles was strategic; by getting onside with the new political reality, P/P agencies were revitalized with increased funding (Tonry, 1990).

The operationalization of get-tough policies commonly referred to as intermediate/graduated sanctions or intensive supervision programs (ISPs) was manifested by establishing prison-like controls over offenders in the community. Supervisory conditions of P/P were expanded, surveillance levels were escalated, and violations were dealt with more rapidly and harshly (Fulton, Gendreau, & Paparozzi, 1995). As Erwin (1986) so passionately put it when referring to the Georgia ISP, considered by many to be the prototype for the United States (Conrad, 1986),

We are in the business of increasing the heat on probationers . . . satisfying the public's demand for just punishment. . . . Criminals must be punished for their misdeeds. (p. 17)

With few exceptions, the new breed of get-tough ISPs discarded treatment services. In one review, Gendreau et al. (2000) found that only 18% of ISPs surveyed in this meta-analysis offered even a modicum of treatment services, and among those, all were of unknown quality. Although these ISPs may have constructively addressed some correctional issues such as sentencing policy, they had a negligible effect on recidivism (Cullen, Wright, & Applegate, 1996; Gendreau, Goggin, & Smith, 2001; Petersilia, Turner, & Deschenes, 1992; Smith, Goggin, & Gendreau, 2002). Why is this? To put it bluntly, the "pee 'em and see 'em" model of P/P supervision (see Cullen, Eck, & Lowenkamp, 2002) was based on primitive notions of punishment, a common-sense faith in vague and uncertain threats, and a disregard for the vast literature on punishment and persuasion (Cullen et al., 2002; Gendreau, 1996; Gendreau, Goggin, Cullen, & Paparozzi, 2002). As well, ISPs have frequently targeted low-risk offenders (Bayens, Manske, & Smykla, 1998; Gendreau & Ross, 1987). From the perspective of the offender rehabilitation literature, this is a counterproductive strategy. This literature has clearly demonstrated that low-risk offenders have been the least likely to benefit from correctional interventions; rather, it is higher risk offenders that have the most to gain from intensive interventions (Andrews & Bonta, 2003; Gendreau, 1996).

In the case of the ISP literature, there were two notable program exceptions to the get-tough ISP movement; one was implemented in New Jersey (Pearson, 1987) and the other in Massachusetts (Byrne & Kelly, 1989). The New Jersey program reported substantial reductions in recidivism (~ 30%)

on their higher risk sample. Although the New Jersey program emphasized a law enforcement approach, it was not typical of ISP program designs of the time in other respects. According to published program descriptions (Pearson & Harper, 1990) and personal contacts (W. Burrell, personal communication, September 10, 2002), most program participants attended peer support sessions led by parole officers (POs) and received substance abuse counseling. Moreover, senior supervisors and policy makers also encouraged the rehabilitative component of the ISP. It should be noted that it was not statistically documented that the ISP group, in fact, received more services than the comparison group and that the comparison group was only an approximate match.

The Massachusetts ISP (Byrne & Kelly, 1989), unlike New Jersey's, did not find that their ISP produced lower recidivism than its regular probation comparison group. One of the reasons given for this result was that the ISP was not fully implemented. The noteworthy feature of this evaluation, however, was that a small subgroup of POs assigned to the ISP and comparison group who were rated as moderate to high in their supervision practices produced lower recidivism in the range of 20% to 30% than POs rated low in their supervision practices. The characteristics of the better quality supervision condition were more contacts with probationers, consistent enforcement of probation conditions, and addressing the needs of higher risk offenders before problems arose.

These two ISP evaluations were prescient, as their results converged with other emerging issues in the offender rehabilitation literature that led to the present investigation.

First, one of the forgotten issues in the correctional treatment literature has been that of program implementation (Gendreau, Goggin, & Smith, 1999). The initial assessment of the effects of implementation on service delivery in corrections appeared in 1979 (Gendreau & Andrews, 1979), but only lately has the topic become the focus of much attention in criminal justice circles (Bernfeld, Farrington, & Leschied, 2001; Hamm & Shrink, 1989; Harris & Smith, 1996; Petersilia, 1990). Recent developments in the assessment of correctional program quality (e.g., the Correctional Program Assessment Inventory; Gendreau & Andrews, 2001; Gendreau et al., 2001; Latessa & Holsinger, 1998) have also emphasized the importance of program implementation. Program implementation encompasses several elements subsumed under the rubric of organizational supportiveness (Gendreau et al., 1999). Although there have been very few attempts at linking organizational supportiveness factors with successful interventions (e.g., Byrne & Kelly, 1989; Fagan, 1990), the implications arising from this field of study is that agencies hosting treatment programs must be supportive of the intervention;

otherwise, the prospects for reducing recidivism will be put in jeopardy (Gendreau et al., 2001).

Second, we are aware of only one study, that of Byrne and Kelly (1989) noted previously, that has related P/P officers' supervisory style with probationer or parolee recidivism. The paucity of attention to the professional orientation of P/P officers, in our view, is somewhat perplexing given the fact that it has been and remains a seminal issue among practitioners with regard to the supervision of parolees. It could be rationally argued that extremes in supervisory approaches produce increases in recidivism (see Cullen et al., 2002; Gendreau, 1996). That is, get-tough P/P officers may be more oriented to changing offenders through threats or by technical rule violations with excessive zeal, whereas those with a more nondirective, excessively forgiving approach, commonly referred to as a social casework style of supervision, may allow offenders to get away with things they should not, thereby inadvertently reinforcing criminal behavior.³ Presumably, a more balanced approach to supervision, as suggested by the Massachusetts ISP, might be a more helpful supervision strategy (see also Andrews & Kiessling, 1980).

Third, it is sometimes assumed that because an offender is enrolled in an ISP, referrals to treatment services automatically ensue. The possibility is raised that some of the negligible effects of ISPs on recidivism reported in the evaluation literature were due, in part, to a program diffusion effect (Posavac & Carey, 2003). In other words, members of the comparison group obtained similar services to those in the experimental or treatment group—a happenstance that likely has occurred in some evaluations of services in P/P settings (e.g., Fagan, 1990; Lichtman & Smock, 1981).

We now turn to the present investigation. The New Jersey Intensive Surveillance and Supervision Program (ISSP) came about because state parole authorities were concerned about the lack of services for several hundred high-risk/high-need parolees. The ISSP attempted to refine and build upon the lessons learned from the previous New Jersey and Massachusetts ISPs. To maximize treatment effectiveness, high-risk parolees were involved in the program, and every effort was made to see to it (and document the fact) that they received more services than the comparison group of parolees that underwent traditional or less intensive traditional parole supervision (TPS). A rigorous matched-sample design was employed. In addition, the supervisory orientation of the POs and the organizational supportiveness of the parole offices where the ISSP took place were assessed using two measures specifically designed for these purposes. The expectation was that more services received by the ISSP parolees, a balanced supervisory style on the part of ISSP staff, and the degree of organizational support within the ISSP would be associated with lower recidivism.

METHOD

MATCHED-SAMPLE DESIGN

Department policies governing the ISSP prohibited random selection of participants for assignment to either the ISSP or TPS. As a result, a matched-sample design was employed. There is evidence indicating that comprehensive matched comparison group samples can adequately resolve problems associated with internal and external validity (Campbell & Stanley, 1963; Lipsey & Wilson, 1992; Maxfield & Babbie, 1995). Moreover, specific to recidivism outcome research on correctional programs, Andrews et al. (1990) demonstrated that the validity of the conclusions reached about correctional program effectiveness was not compromised if the comparison group in a particular study was carefully chosen to be comparable to the experimental group as to risk level.

The matching variables were selected based upon the following: (a) their date-related relationship to criminal behavior in the state of New Jersey (i.e., date of prison commitment, county of commitment, date of parole), (b) their documented empirical relationship with recidivism (i.e., age, gender, years of education, alcohol/drug history, family status; Gendreau, Little, & Goggin, 1996), and (c) the Wisconsin classification system (Baird, Heinz, & Bemus, 1979).

Two of the 10 matching variables, family status and the classification system, require further clarification. Family status indicates that an inmate was released on parole to the residence of a supportive family member or a significant other serving as a surrogate family member as opposed to needing housing in a shelter or other public assistance program. The Wisconsin classification system is made up of three parts: a risk form, a need form, and a client management part. Predictive validities of the risk form are well established (Bonta, 1996), and it was this part of the Wisconsin classification system (see Andrews & Bonta, 2003, p. 243) that was used to assign risk levels to parolees.

Table 1 presents the matching data for date-related variables.

DATA COLLECTION

Type and Amount of Services Received by Parolees

With regard to the level of treatment services, the following data were collected: (a) the number and type of referrals for social services made by the

TABLE 1: Matched-Sample Percentages

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Matched Same Year (%)</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>+/- 3 Years (%)</i>	<i>n</i>
Percentage of exact and approximate match on date-related profile variables				
Birth date	75.8	182	24.2	58
Parole date	85.8	206	14.2	34
Commitment date	33.3	80	66.6	160
Percentage of match on nondate-related variables				
Offense	81.7	196	18.3	44
Race/ethnicity	99.0	238	1.0	2
Gender	99.0	238	1.0	2
Education ^a	84.2	202	15.8	38
Substance abuse history	92.3	222	7.7	18
Risk assessment	82.5	198	17.5	42
Family status ^b	94.2	226	5.8	14
County of commitment	94.2	226	5.8	14

a. Years of education were grouped as follows: 0, 1 to 4, 5 to 8, 9 to 12, and posthigh school.

b. Primary financial support provided by family/host residence (nonpublic assistance).

ISSP and TPS officers and (b) the number and type of social service activities actually engaged in by the sample participants. If, for example, one participant was referred to three different types of social services, the frequency for referrals numbered three. Active engagement in a social service program was measured as admission to and enrollment in a referred social service program. The verification of services received was determined by a manual review of case records. The referral and actual service delivery categories examined were (a) education and/or training programs, (b) mental health counseling, (c) medical and dental services, (d) housing and sheltered living arrangements, (e) public assistance (including welfare disability and unemployment benefits), (f) employment, (g) substance abuse counseling, (h) enrollment in a vocational training program, and (i) assistance to family.

Organizational Supportiveness

A system risk factor inventory was administered to examine the level of organizational supportiveness and its impact on recidivism for both ISSP and TPS parolees. The inventory used was an adapted version of the Lederman Interview Schedule (Lederman, 1986) modified by the second author for the purposes of this study.⁴

The Lederman measure is composed of three organizational supportiveness indices: (a) agency and contract conditions at program's entry (26 items), (b) consultation process (69 items), and (c) consultation product (15 items). Each item is scored on a 4-point scale (0 to 3); the higher the score, the better the organizational supportiveness. The maximum score obtainable is 330.

To obtain a reliable assessment of the organizational supportiveness of each of the 12 parole offices involved in this study, each district office was visited on three occasions by the program administrator and the administrator's program assistant. The site visits were scheduled to be approximately 6 to 8 months apart. The program administrator and his assistant conducted each of their site visits on different days, generally within a 4- to 6-week period. The decision to conduct site visits on separate days was based on the belief that this method would yield a more accurate impression of the organizational environment across time. Each site visit lasted for 1 full day and involved discussions with the district supervisor of the office and two POs not assigned to the ISSP.

Immediately following each discussion, the program administrator and his assistant wrote a brief synopsis of the discussions. This qualitative information, as well as the longstanding knowledge of the staff and organizational settings possessed by the raters, informed the respective ratings given to a district office by each rater on the Lederman measure. The raters recorded their responses on the Lederman measure independently and had no discussions about the ratings with each other before, during, or after the ratings were given. The tabulation of scores was conducted by the second author.

As can be seen from Table 2, the raters had a strong disagreement over District L (a 22% difference), which was subsequently omitted from further analysis. All other sites were rated within a range of 3% to 15% by the two supervisors. Six sites were rated as supportive (Districts A, B, C, D, E, and F). The mean supportiveness scores for these sites for the two raters were 68% and 64%, respectively. Five sites were rated as less supportive (Districts G, H, I, J, and K). The mean supportiveness scores for the two raters were 49% and 43%, respectively, for these sites.

Assessment of PO Orientation

The orientation of POs assigned to the ISSP was determined by administering a questionnaire designed to measure punishment versus social case-work orientations toward supervision. The Parole Officer Punishment and Reintegrative Orientation Questionnaire (Dembo, 1972) was administered to each officer.⁵ This 24-item questionnaire is designed to measure the punish-

TABLE 2: System Risk Percentage Rating Scores

<i>District Office</i>	<i>Rater #1 (%)</i>	<i>Rater #2 (%)</i>
G	39	37
H	56	41
A	64	61
B	65	65
I	47	47
L	73	51
C	69	66
D	65	62
J	53	44
E	74	68
K	50	44
F	70	63
Mean	60	54

ment versus reintegrative orientation of POs. The response to each item is rated on a continuum from 1 (*punishment orientation*) to 7 (*social casework orientation*). To score an individual's questionnaire, the point score for each of the 24 items was summed. Because the overall score of a completed questionnaire was the sum total of the 24 responses, the possible score range was from 24 to 168. A law enforcement orientation was defined as a score within the range of 24 to 71. An officer was considered to have a balanced approach to supervision (a blend of law enforcement and social casework) if the score fell within 72 to 120. The point range for the social casework category was 121 to 168. The scores for the 12 ISSP officers included in this study were equally divided across the three orientation categories specified above.

Staff Characteristics

The ISSP group of supervising POs consisted of one ISSP PO assigned to each of 12 district parole offices. Each ISSP PO was assigned a caseload of 20 to 25 parolees. PO assignment to the ISSP was based on either a lateral transfer into the ISSP, in which case strict adherence to employee seniority was a selection requirement, or a result of their rank ordering on a standard state department of personnel (civil service) promotional exam. Ten POs were male, 2 were female, 10 were White (Western European descent), 2 were Black (African American), 6 were between 30 and 40 years of age, and 6 were in the 40-to-60 age range.

Numerous POs were involved in the supervision of comparison group parolees (the TPS group). The POs assigned to TPS were assigned caseloads

averaging 75 to 85 parolees. Because of operating procedures within the agency, demographics of the TPS POs and the distribution of comparison group parolees across TPS POs statewide were not available. Based on the first author's extensive experience with rules and regulations governing reassignments and promotions within the host agency, it is his opinion that the ISSP and TPS staffs were representative of the makeup of POs at the time.

Measures of Outcome

The outcome variables examined were (a) technical violation—a technical program violation consisted of any breach of a condition of parole release; (b) new conviction—a new conviction was defined as a conviction for an indictable offense committed during the current parole trial (the first conviction was counted; multiple convictions were counted as one conviction, because any conviction resulted in certain revocation); and (c) revocation—revocation occurred for technical reasons or for a new conviction.

There was a concern expressed by the sponsoring agency that the three above-noted outcome indices, being dichotomous, were not sensitive to multiple incidents of offending, which was assumed to frequently occur in the samples being assessed. A second concern was that the ISSP parolees might produce more multiple incidents (e.g., arrests) that would not be documented otherwise. An arrest outcome measure was established that counted multiple arrests. Neither concern was justified. As it turned out, only 3% of the ISSP and TPS groups recorded a multiple arrest, and they were equally divided between the two groups. Consequently, the analysis of the results did not employ this outcome measure.

The parolees in the ISSP and TPS groups were followed up for 12 months after their release on parole.

RESULTS

The results of the New Jersey ISSP are presented in the following order:

1. Description and comparison of the two samples
2. Comparison of the ISSP and TPS programs on services referred and received by three outcome measures of recidivism and by risk level
3. Comparison of the combined frequency of recidivism for ISSP and TPS participants by organizational supportiveness
4. Comparison of recidivism rates of ISSP participants by ISSP officer orientation

TABLE 3: Characteristics of Sample

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Experimental Parolees (%)</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Comparison Parolees (%)</i>	<i>n</i>
Race/ethnicity				
Black	59.2	142	59.2	142
White	31.3	75	30.8	74
Hispanic	9.6	23	10.0	24
Gender				
Male	82.1	197	82.5	198
Female	17.9	23	17.5	42
Age				
18 to 27	25.4	61	25.6	59
28 to 37	47.9	115	49.1	118
33 to 42	20.4	49	21.3	51
42+	6.3	15	5.0	12
Psychotropic medication	15.0	36	2.0	5
History of substance abuse	81.3	195	73.8	177
Risk/needs assessment				
High	81.7	196	72.9	175
Medium	18.3	44	27.1	65
Low	0.0	0	0.0	0
Family supportiveness				
Supportive	68.3	164	65.4	157
Nonsupportive	31.7	76	34.6	83
Commitment offense				
Violent crime, with a weapon	12.9	31	16.3	39
Violent crime, no weapon	35.0	84	27.5	66
Property offense	13.3	32	14.1	34
Drug offense	36.3	87	32.1	77
Other	2.5	6	10.0	24
Level of education				
1 to 4	5.0	12	0.0	0
5 to 8	25.8	62	33.7	81
9 to 12	68.8	165	66.3	159
Posthigh school	0.4	1	0.0	0

1. DESCRIPTION AND COMPARISON OF THE TWO SAMPLES

Characteristics of Parolees

Table 3 summarizes the characteristics of the ISSP and TPS groups on the eight risk factors as well as the Wisconsin risk measure. There were no low-risk parolees in the sample as defined by the Wisconsin risk measure (score of 0-16). The great majority of parolees were high risk (45 to 61).

Inspection of Table 3 reveals that, if anything, the ISSP parolees were of a slightly higher risk. The chi-square calculations indicated that the ISSP

TABLE 4: Percentage of Parolees Receiving Services in the Intensive Surveillance and Supervision Program (ISSP) and Traditional Parole Supervision (TPS) Groups

<i>Service Provided</i>	<i>ISSP (%)</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>TPS (%)</i>	<i>n</i>
Substance abuse counseling	42.1	101	25.8	62
Educational/vocational training	35.0	84	16.7	40
Months employed full-time ^a				
1 to 3 months	14.3	30	17.0	40
4 to 6 months	11.4	24	11.0	26
7 to 9 months	15.2	32	16.6	39
10 to 12 months	17.6	37	11.9	28
Total employed	58.6	123	57.3	133
Mental health counseling	25.4	61	1.7	4
Public assistance	41.3	99	15.4	37
Other form of counseling	8.8	21	0.0	0
Family-provided assistance	7.9	19	1.0	2

a. Number of participants who were employable in the ISSP and TPS groups were 210 and 235, respectively.

group had (a) a higher risk level, $\chi^2(2, N = 240) = 5.23, p < .05$; (b) less education, $\chi^2(3, N = 240) = 32.26, p < .01$; (c) a greater reliance on psychotropic medication, $\chi^2(1, N = 240) = 25.63, p < .01$; and (d) a greater percentage of substance abuse problems in their history, $\chi^2(1, N = 240) = 3.87, p < .05$.

2. COMPARISON OF THE ISSP AND TPS PROGRAMS ON SERVICES REFERRED AND RECEIVED AND ON THREE OUTCOME MEASURES OF RECIDIVISM AND BY RISK LEVEL

Service Referral and Services Received

A total of 396 referrals for service were provided to ISSP parolees and 698 to TPS clients. The difference in frequency of referral to these two groups was statistically significant, $t = 3.07, df = 6, p < .05$.

As to services actually received by the ISSP and TPS parolees, more were obtained by the ISSP group, $t = 3.44, df = 6, p < .05$. The largest differences in the type of services received between the two groups were for substance abuse, mental health counseling, educational and vocational training, and public assistance.

ISSP and TPS Results on Three Measures of Recidivism

Table 5 depicts the percentage of offenders in each group that recidivated in each of the three outcome categories. The ISSP group had more technical

TABLE 5: Recidivism Outcome for Intensive Surveillance and Supervision Program (ISSP) and Traditional Parole Supervision (TPS) Groups

<i>Outcome Measure</i>	<i>ISSP</i> (%; n = 240)	<i>TPS</i> (%; n = 240)	χ^2
Technical violation	18.3	11.3	4.78*
Revocation for new conviction	19.2	47.5	43.35**
Revocation	37.5	58.8	21.71**

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

violations (7%), lower new convictions (28%), and a lower percentage of revocations (21%). In each comparison, the results were statistically significant.

As there were small variations in the exact matching procedures, logistic regression analysis (Aldrich & Nelson, 1984) was employed to determine whether the statistically significant results held after controlling for race, birth, risk, family support, gender, education, year of parole release, year of commitment to prison, drug/alcohol history, psychotropic medication, and type of offense. After conducting the logistic regression analysis, the significant results reported across all three measures of outcome in the table were maintained.⁶

3. COMPARISON OF THE RECIDIVISM OF ISSP AND TPS PARTICIPANTS BY ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORTIVENESS

Organizational Supportiveness

Table 6 outlines the combined recidivism results for ISSP and TPS participants across three measures of outcome by organizational supportiveness. In this comparison, there were six supportive and five nonsupportive offices. In every instance but that of revocation for new conviction, the differences in recidivism between the supportive and nonsupportive offices were statistically significant.

Further multivariate analyses were conducted to determine the estimated effect on recidivism of the organizational support variable after accounting for those variables that demonstrated significant predictive potential in estimating the dependent variables. These variables were (a) ISSP versus TPS, (b) risk level, (c) level of education, and (d) drug/alcohol history. The results from the regression confirmed the outcome results for technical violation reported in Table 6. The results reported for revocation for new conviction and revocation in Table 6 were not supported. However, after controlling for the above-noted predictors, the initial chi-square finding of a nonsignificant

TABLE 6: Combined Recidivism Outcomes for Intensive Surveillance and Supervision Program and Traditional Parole Supervision Groups by Level of Organizational Supportiveness

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Supportive (%; n = 240)</i>	<i>Nonsupportive (%; n = 220)</i>	χ^2
Technical violation	13.3	27.3	7.42**
Revocation for new conviction	17.1	22.7	1.14
Revocation	30.4	50.0	9.26**

** $p < .01$.

relationship between supportiveness and revocation for new conviction was found to be statistically significant, Wald = 6.66, $df = 1$, $p < .01$.

4. COMPARISON OF RECIDIVISM RATES OF ISSP PARTICIPANTS BY ISSP OFFICER ORIENTATION

Professional Orientation of ISSP Officers

Within the ISSP group of parolees ($N = 240$), PO orientation ($N = 12$) was associated with significant reductions in recidivism on the three outcome measures of concern. ISSP parolees assigned to law enforcement officers received more technical violations. Officers defined as balanced had significantly lower instances of new conviction and revocation. Table 7 outlines the data in this regard.

To more precisely assess the effects of PO orientation on recidivism, the category-balanced orientation was established as the reference category to the law enforcement and social work categories. The variables included in the logistic regression model were (a) the three levels of PO orientation, (b) ISSP versus TPS, (c) risk level, (d) level of education, and (e) alcohol/drug history.

Consistent with the results from Table 7 for technical violation, the regression results indicated that each of the three levels of PO orientation were significantly different from each other (for all Wald values, $p < .01$). None of the other variables in the model was found to be significantly related to outcome.

For new conviction, the regression findings indicated that a balanced orientation was associated with significantly less recidivism than a PO possessing either a social work or law enforcement orientation. The education variable was significantly associated with the criterion, Wald = 6.74, $df = 1$, $p < .001$.

TABLE 7: Outcome Measures for Intensive Surveillance and Supervision Program (ISSP) Parolees by ISSP Officer Orientation

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Law</i>		
	<i>Enforcement (%)</i>	<i>Balanced (%)</i>	<i>Social Work (%)</i>
Technical violation ^a	42.5	12.7	5.4
Revocation for new conviction ^b	16.2	6.3	32.3
Revocation ^c	58.8	19.0	37.9

a. $\chi^2 = 38.90, p < .01$.

b. $\chi^2 = 19.08, p < .01$.

c. $\chi^2 = 24.74, p < .01$.

In regard to the findings for revocation, there was statistical independence between all levels of PO orientation and criterion. The same result applied to the education variable.

DISCUSSION

Since the late 1970s, probation and parole organizations endorsed the movement toward getting tough, lest they be relegated to bureaucratic insignificance or, worse, extinction. If popularity is an index of success, then sanctions-based ISPs have achieved their goal. They have apparently met the perceived need of getting tough on crime as well as marketing themselves to legislators as safe alternatives to incarceration for low-risk offenders to cope with the high costs of incarceration and the political need to contain tax increases (Pearson & Harper, 1990).

On the other hand, as noted previously, the evidence is incontrovertible: Without the provision of treatment services, ISPs will have little, if any, effects recidivism (Gendreau et al., 2000). The present study, along with a handful of others (e.g., Byrne & Kelly, 1989; Pearson, 1987), reinforces this point. The extent of the reductions in recidivism for the ISSP in this evaluation was considerable (in the 20% to 30% range), which corresponds to the results from the other New Jersey ISP and Massachusetts. As well, the meta-analyses of the offender treatment literature indicate that programs that follow the principles of effective treatment—those that are cognitive behavioral targeting the criminogenic needs of high-risk offenders—produce reductions in recidivism of a similar magnitude (Andrews & Bonta, 2003; Cullen & Gendreau, 2000).

Did the practices of the POs in this study conform to these principles enough to produce the sizeable treatment gains in this study? It is only known

for certain that the ISSP's parolees received more services and that a higher risk sample was involved. It could not, unfortunately, be ascertained whether the community agencies and the ISSP POs were using appropriate behavioral treatment methods or whether they specifically targeted parolees' criminogenic needs. However, the first author's intimate knowledge of the ISSP POs and their supervision practices suggest that this might have been the case for some officers. Even if further research on ISPs discovers smaller reductions in recidivism, recent cost analyses intimate that substantial cost savings will accrue even with results of a much lesser magnitude than those reported here (Cullen & Gendreau, 2000). In our view, what is urgently needed is replication of the present findings with experimental designs⁷ and longer follow-up evaluations that delve into the black box of the quality of services provided. Furthermore, as to the black box issue, we recommend not leaving it to serendipity in the future to see whether POs provide effective services. Program implementers should see to it that they have the appropriate training (for an example, see Andrews & Bonta, 2003, pp. 311-316).

This ISSP, not surprisingly, significantly increased technical violations. Violations are often a key practitioner marketing point for ISPs, because technical violations (i.e., violations absent a new crime) are promoted as the successful avoidance of new crime even though there is no evidence to support this belief (Clear, Harris, & Baird, 1992; Petersilia & Turner, 1993). Higher occurrences of technical violations are to be expected in ISPs for three reasons: (a) ISPs involve the imposition of significantly more release contingencies, (b) there is intensive watching of offenders, and (c) there is a smaller staff workload. The three aforementioned factors result in more opportunity for rule breaking, efficient detection, and rapid violation processing. The nature of the ISP officer can also affect the prevalence of technical violations. This study demonstrated that it was law-enforcement-oriented POs, in particular, who increased technical violations dramatically (43%), whereas balanced and social casework POs used technical violations sparingly.

As important as the above findings regarding a treatment effect, the results regarding PO supervisory orientation and organizational supportiveness may be as important in the long run for developing effective ISPs. Before discussing the findings in this regard, it must be stressed that the measures employed to assess these constructs were exploratory. Secondly, there was no way of disentangling the effect of these two factors from the overall treatment effect size. Professional orientation was not recorded for TPS officers, and ISSP and TPS POs functioned in both supportive and nonsupportive offices. Obviously, future evaluations in this domain will require stronger designs to disentangle the unique contributions of these factors. Having said

that, the potential utility of these service delivery variables merit further comment.

Recall, the professional orientations were categorized as law enforcement, balanced, and social casework. The officers defined as balanced had greater reductions in recidivism overall as well as reductions on the measure of new convictions. One reason the balanced POs may have been successful is that they adhered to a firm and fair supervisory style, which has been found to be an effective strategy in supervising probationers (Andrews & Kiessling, 1980). It is conjectured that the law enforcement officers placed undue emphasis on surveillance and had little interest in treatment thereby making the delivery of helpful services difficult (Conrad, 1991; Lynch, 1998; McCleary, 1992). Indeed, these officers strain prison capacities. The social casework officers' diminished success may have been attributable to non-directive, unstructured, and permissive approaches in the course of supervising ISSP participants. These are not useful supervision strategies with offenders.⁸

Some experts in the field may feel uneasy about reconciling policing and social casework models—that is, it is impossible to perform contradictory roles. Rather, we favor Clear and Latessa's (1990) perspective. They affirm that there should be little incompatibility, and where conflicts exist, it is the professional responsibility of POs to resolve these issues, not unlike that of many other professionals in unrelated areas. Although much more needs to be known about PO supervisory practices, a self-evident policy recommendation from this study is that POs be hired who can balance law enforcement and social casework tasks and who value the notion that recidivism reduction through rehabilitation practices is a desirable goal of parole agencies.

The organizational supportiveness index was in the developmental stages when it was used in this study. Nevertheless, the dimensions of supportiveness measured on this index were consistent with several of the elements associated with successful programs identified by Petersilia (1990): (a) The program addresses a pressing local need and its objectives are clearly defined and reflect the needs of the customer; (b) the program has a receptive environment in both the parent organization and the larger system and stakeholders who are committed to the objectives, values, and implications of the program and who can devise practical strategies to motivate and effect change; (c) the program has a director who shares the leader's ideas and values and uses them to guide the implementation and ongoing operation of the program; (d) practitioners make the program their own, participate in its development, and have incentives to maintain its integrity during the change process; and (e) the agency has secure administrators, low staff turnover, and sufficient resources.

It would be reasonable to speculate that the supportive offices were more diligent about seeing that their POs provided quality supervision to program participants in both the ISSP and TPS groups. The important point is that improvements in reductions in recidivism may be achievable by attention to low-cost or no-cost modifications to organizational factors. Obviously, much more research needs to be done to assess which components of the organizational supportiveness measure may be most useful. Again, the policy implication of this result is manifest. Every effort should be made to ensure that the system at the local service delivery level encourages and supports front-line staff to deliver quality services.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we well recognize the limitations of any one study (see Schmidt, 1992) and that replication is absolutely essential for generating sound policies that affect people's—in this case, offenders'—lives. Having said that, there was a good deal of consistency across four outcome measures and with two other ISPs of a similar nature. More treatment services were provided to ISSP participants, the services were provided to higher risk offenders, and the supportiveness of the organizational environment as well as the integration of the law enforcement and social casework functions of POs appeared to have positive effects on outcomes. In short, this program worked because it was likely very different from surveillance-oriented ISPs. Key policy makers, professionals, and politicians alike cannot ignore the spate of criticism that began with national headlines such as

Overall outcomes might have been different if a greater proportion of the sample had been employed and had participated in rehabilitative activities. (comments on the Rand ISP evaluation studies made in the *Los Angeles Times* and carried nationally; "Intensified Supervision," 1991, p. 3A)

Hopefully, the recent renewed interest in prisoner reentry—parole, by any other name—will be driven as much by the evidence regarding effectiveness as by the economics of the day.⁹

NOTES

1. The antirehabilitation agenda had less of an impact in Canada and the United Kingdom where correctional policy makers and practitioners continued to support attempts to help offenders (Gendreau et al., 2000; Raynor & Vanstone, 2001).

2. Cochran (1989) argued that by discarding their helping role, parole and probation staff lost many of their professional skills.

3. This classification is not intended as a slight against the profession of social work in general; it is a valued profession. Within the correctional treatment literature, however, programs conducted by social workers have not been associated with effectiveness (Davidson, Gottschalk, Gensheimer, & Mayer, 1984), because treatment strategies emanating from this profession's approach to offender treatment have oftentimes been inappropriate for offenders (e.g., Gendreau, 1996, p. 126).

4. A copy of the modified Lederman Interview Schedule can be obtained from the first author.

5. A copy of the Parole Officer Punishment and Reintegrative Orientation Questionnaire can be obtained from the first author.

6. A complete tabular summary of the regression analyses reported in the results can be obtained from the first author.

7. Of the intensive surveillance programs discussed in this study, the present one arguably had the strongest quasi-experimental group design. There was a close match on all variables except date of commitment, and even in this case, two thirds of the sample was committed to prison within 3 years. The length of incarceration was not available to the researchers. Recent meta-analyses have found that varying lengths of time in prison have little, if any, effect on recidivism (Gendreau, Goggin, Cullen, & Andrews, 2000; Smith et al., 2002).

8. This classification is not intended as a slight against the profession of social work in general; it is a valued profession. Within the correctional treatment literature, however, programs conducted by social workers have not been associated with effectiveness (Davidson, Gottschalk, Gensheimer, & Mayer, 1984), because treatment strategies emanating from this profession's approach to offender treatment have oftentimes been inappropriate for offenders (e.g., Gendreau, 1996, p. 126).

9. The first author is currently involved in national and state-level reentry policy councils. These forums are now into their 2nd year. One of the major themes of these forums is that national and local governments can no longer afford to continue large-scale incarceration of lawbreakers without dramatic tax consequences and cost shifting from education, health, and a number of competing policy initiatives.

REFERENCES

- Aldrich, J. H., & Nelson, F. D. (1984). *Linear probability, logit, and probit models*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (2003). *The psychology of criminal conduct*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.
- Andrews, D. A., & Kiessling, J. J. (1980). Program structure and effective correctional practices: A summary of the CaVic research. In R. R. Ross & P. (Eds.), *Effective correctional treatment* (pp. 441-463). Toronto, Canada: Butterworths.
- Andrews, D., Zinger, I., Hoge, R. D., Bonta, J., Gendreau, P., & Cullen, F. T. (1990). Does correctional treatment work? A clinically relevant and psychologically informed meta-analysis. *Criminology*, 28, 369-404.
- Baird, C. S., Heinz, R. C., & Bemus, B. J. (1979). *The Wisconsin case classification/staff deployment project: A two year follow-up report*. Madison, WI: Health & Social Services Department.
- Bayens, G. J., Manske, M. W., & Smykla, J. (1998). The impact of the "new penology" on ISP. *Criminal Justice Review*, 23, 51-62.

- Bernfeld, G. A., Farrington, D. P., & Leschied, A. W. (Eds.). (2001). *Offender rehabilitation and treatment: Implementing and evaluating effective programs*. West Chichester, UK: Wiley.
- Bonta, J. (1996). Risk-needs assessment and treatment. In A. T. Harland (Ed.), *Choosing correctional options that work* (pp. 18-32). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Byrne, J. M., & Kelly, L. (1989). *Restructuring probation as an intermediate sanction: An evaluation of the Massachusetts intensive probation supervision program*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice, Research Program on the Punishment & Control of Offenders.
- Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. (1963). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Clear, T., Harris, P. M., & Baird, C. S. (1992). Probation violations and officer response. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 20, 1-12.
- Clear, T., & Latessa, E. (1990). Probation officer roles in intensive supervision: Surveillance versus treatment. *Justice Quarterly*, 10, 441-462.
- Clear, T., & Rumgay, J. (1992). Divided by a common language: British and American probation cultures. *Federal Probation*, 3, 3-11.
- Cochran, D. (1989). A practitioner's perspective. *Research in Corrections*, 2, 57-63.
- Conrad, J. P. (1986). The penal dilemma and its emerging solution. *Crime and Delinquency*, 31, 411-422.
- Conrad, J. P. (1991). The pessimistic reflections of a chronic optimist. *Federal Probation*, 55, 4-9.
- Cullen, F. T., Eck, J. E., & Lowenkamp, C. (2002). Environmental corrections: A new paradigm of effective probation and parole supervision. *Federal Probation*, 66, 28-37.
- Cullen, F. T., & Gendreau, P. (1989). The effectiveness of correctional rehabilitation. In L. Goodstein & D. L. MacKenzie (Eds.), *The American prison: Issues in research policy* (pp. 23-44). New York: Plenum.
- Cullen, F. T., & Gendreau, P. (2000). Assessing correctional rehabilitation: Policy, practice, and prospects. In J. Horney (Ed.), *Criminal justice 2000: Vol. 4. Policies, processes, and decisions of the criminal justice system* (pp. 109-175). Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice.
- Cullen, F. T., & Gendreau, P. (2001). From nothing works to what works: Changing professional ideology in the 21st century. *The Prison Journal*, 81, 313-338.
- Cullen, F. T., Wright, J., & Applegate, B. (1996). Control in the community: The limits of reform. In A. Harland (Ed.), *Choosing correctional options that work: Defining the demand and evaluating the supply* (pp. 69-116). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Davidson, W., Redner, R., Blakely, C., Mitchell, C., & Emshoff, J. (1987). Diversion of juvenile offenders: An experimental comparison. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 55, 68-75.
- Davidson, W., Gottschalk, L., Gensheimer, L., & Mayer, J. (1984). *Interventions with juvenile delinquents: A meta-analysis of treatment efficacy*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Juvenile Justice & Delinquency Prevention.
- Dembo, R. (1972). Orientation and activities of the parole officer. *Criminology*, 10, 193-215.
- Erwin, B. S. (1986). Turning up the heat on probationers in Georgia. *Federal Probation*, 50, 17-24.
- Fagan, J. (1990). Social and legal policy dimensions of violent juvenile crime. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 17, 93-133.
- Fulton, B., Gendreau, P., & Paparozzi, M. (1995). APPA's prototypical intensive supervision program: ISP as it was meant to be. *Perspectives*, 19, 25-41.

- Gendreau, P. (1996). The principles of effective intervention with offenders. In A. T. Harland (Ed.), *Choosing correctional options that work* (pp. 117-130). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gendreau, P., & Andrews, D. A. (1979). Psychological consultation in correctional agencies: Case studies and general issues. In J. J. Platt & R. J. Wicks (Eds.), *The psychological consultant* (pp. 177-212). New York: Grune & Stratton.
- Gendreau, P., & Andrews, D. (2001). *Correctional Program Assessment Inventory—2000 (CPAI-2000)*. Saint John, Canada: Authors.
- Gendreau, P., Goggin, C., Cullen, F., & Andrews, D. A. (2000). The effects of community sanctions and incarceration on recidivism. *Forum on Corrections Research, 12*, 10-13.
- Gendreau, P., Goggin, C., Cullen, F., & Paparozzi, M. (2002). The common-sense revolution and correctional policy. In J. McGuire (Ed.), *Offender rehabilitation and treatment: Effective programmes and policies to reduce re-offending* (pp. 359-386). West Chichester, UK: Wiley.
- Gendreau, P., Goggin, C., & Fulton, B. (2000). Intensive supervision in probation and parole. In C. Hollin (Ed.), *Handbook of offender assessment and treatment* (pp. 195-204). Chichester, UK: Wiley.
- Gendreau, P., Goggin, C., & Smith, P. (1999). The forgotten issue in effective correctional treatment: Program implementation. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 43*, 180-187.
- Gendreau, P., Goggin, C., & Smith, P. (2001). Implementing correctional interventions in the "real" world. In G. A. Bernfeld, D. P. Farrington, & A. W. Lescheid (Eds.), *Inside the black box in corrections* (pp. 247-268). Chichester, UK: Wiley.
- Gendreau, P., Little, T., & Goggin, C. (1996). A meta-analysis of the predictors of adult offender recidivism: What works! *Criminology, 34*, 575-607.
- Gendreau, P., & Ross, R. R. (1987). Revivification of rehabilitation: Evidence from the 80s. *Justice Quarterly, 4*, 349-407.
- Hamm, M. S., & Schrink, J. L. (1989). The conditions of effective implementation: A guide to accomplishing rehabilitative objectives in corrections. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 16*, 166-182.
- Harris, P., & Smith, S. (1996). Developing community corrections. In A. T. Harland (Ed.), *Choosing correctional interventions that work: Defining the demand and evaluating the supply* (pp. 183-222). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Healy, W. (1915). *The individual delinquent: A textbook of diagnosis and prognosis for all concerned in understanding offenders*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Intensified supervision of probation found ineffective—crime: Rand Study. (1991, July 31). *Los Angeles Times*, p. 3A.
- Latessa, E. J., & Holsinger, A. (1998). The importance of evaluating correctional programs: Assessing outcome and quality. *Corrections Management Quarterly, 2*, 22-29.
- Lederman, M. (1986). *Organizational Supportiveness Index—System Risk Inventory*. Unpublished manuscript, Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada.
- Lichtman, C. M., & Smock, S. M. (1981). The effects of social services on probationer recidivism. *The Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 18*, 81-100.
- Lipsey, M. W., & Wilson, D. B. (1992). The efficacy of psychological, educational, and behavioral treatment. *American Psychologist, 48*, 1181-1209.
- Lynch, M. (1998). Waste managers? New penology, crime fighting, and the parole agent identity. *Law and Society Review, 32*, 839-869.
- Maxfield, M., & Babbie, E. (1995). *Research methods for criminal justice and criminology*. New York: Wadsworth.
- McCleary, R. (1992). *Dangerous men: The sociology of parole*. New York: Harrow & Hester.
- Menninger, K. (1968). *The crime of punishment*. New York: Viking.

- Pearson, F. (1987). Evaluation of New Jersey's intensive supervision program. *Crime and Delinquency*, 34, 437-448.
- Pearson, F., & Harper, A. G. (1990). Contingent intermediate sentences: New Jersey's intensive supervision program. *Crime and Delinquency*, 36, 75-86.
- Petersilia, J. (1990). Conditions that permit intensive supervision programs to survive. *Crime and Delinquency*, 36, 126-145.
- Petersilia, J., & Turner, S. (1993). Intensive probation and parole. In M. Tonry (Ed.), *Crime and justice: A review of the research*, Vol. 17 (pp. 281-336). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Petersilia, J., Turner, S., & Deschenes, E. P. (1992). Intensive supervision for drug offenders. In J. Byrne, A. Lurigio, & J. Petersilia (Eds.), *Smart sentencing: The emergence of intermediate sanctions* (pp. 12-17). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Posavac, E. J., & Carey, G. C. (2003). *Program evaluation: Methods and case studies*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Raynor, P., & Vanstone, M. (2001). "Straight thinking on probation": Evidence-based practice and the culture of curiosity. In G. A. Bernfeld, D. P. Farrington, & A. W. Leschied (Eds.), *Offender rehabilitation and treatment: Implementing and evaluating effective programs* (pp. 189-203). West Chichester, UK: Wiley.
- Ross, R. R., Fabiano, E. A., & Eweles, C. D. (1988). Reasoning and rehabilitation. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 32, 29-35.
- Ross, R. R., & Gendreau, P. (1980). *Effective correctional treatment*. Toronto, Canada: Butterworths.
- Schmidt, F. L. (1992). What do data really mean? Research findings, meta-analysis, and cumulative knowledge in psychology. *American Psychologist*, 47, 1173-1181.
- Smith, P., Goggin, C., & Gendreau, P. (2002). *The effects of prison sentences and intermediate sanctions on recidivism: General effects and individual differences*. Ottawa, Canada: Correctional Services of Canada.
- Sutherland, E. H. (1939). *Principles of criminology* (3rd ed.). Chicago: Lipincott.
- Task Force on Corrections, President's Commission on Law Enforcement & Administration of Justice. (1967). *Task force report: Corrections*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Toby, J. (1964). Is punishment necessary? *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science*, 55, 332-337.
- Tonry, M. (1990). Stated and latent functions of ISP. *Crime and Delinquency*, 36, 174-191.

Mario A. Paparozzi is former chair of the New Jersey State Parole Board and served as president of the American Probation and Parole Association. He is currently conducting research on the relationship between professional credentials and recidivism outcomes in correctional environments.

Paul Gendreau is director of the Centre for Criminal Justice Studies, University of New Brunswick at St. John. The center provides research and professional services relating to the study of criminal justice, policing, and related fields of study. The institute focuses on applied and practical matters relating to criminal justice research and practice but also conducts basic research relating to criminal justice matters.