

Research in Review

Bureau of Management Information Services

Division of Planning, Research and Statistics

Editor: Gary Zajac (717)730-2725

Summary and Major Findings of Articles Reviewed in This Issue

Bert Useem and Michael D. Reisig. 1999. "Collective Action in Prisons: Protests, Disturbances and Riots." *Criminology*, 37(4), 735-759. Page 3

This article examines the factors that contributed to riots and other types of disturbances in over 300 state correctional facilities. Competing explanations of such occurrences are tested. The authors find that riots and other disturbances are less likely to occur in prisons that maintain a high level of staff esprit de corps, that control the development of security threat groups and that minimize conflict between officers and inmates. The authors find no evidence that attempts by prison administrators to "crack down" on inmate privileges or liberties lead to riots.

Jeanne B. Stinchcomb. 1999. "Recovering from the Shocking Reality of Shock Incarceration – What Correctional Administrators Can Learn from Boot Camp Failures." *Corrections Management Quarterly*, 3(4), 43-52. Page 5

This article discusses the negative findings of many boot camp evaluations, arguing that important lessons about program implementation and offender assessment and selection can be learned from these studies. Rather than condemning boot camps as a failed correctional model, researcher and practitioners should use evaluation findings to enhance the positive features of these camps.

Clifford A. Butzin, et alii. 1999. "Measuring the Impact of Drug Treatment: Beyond Relapse and Recidivism." *Corrections Management Quarterly*, 3(4), 1-7. Page 6

This article examines the impact of the CREST therapeutic community in Delaware on the relapse and employment outcomes of offenders. The authors find that the CREST program has a positive impact upon employment and relapse to drug use. Moreover, the CREST program also seems to insulate unemployed ex-offenders against a return to drug use. The authors conclude that valuable insight into the effectiveness of correctional treatment can be gained by examining outcome indicators other than recidivism.

Agnes L. Baro. 1999. "Effects of A Cognitive Restructuring Program on Inmate Institutional Behavior." *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 26(4), 466-484. Page 7

This article reports on the impact of a cognitive behavioral/restructuring treatment program upon inmate institutional behavior in a Michigan prison. This study finds that inmates who participate in this program tend to exhibit better institutional behavior than similar inmates who have not had the program. This research suggests that cognitive treatment programs have benefits that extend beyond reductions in recidivism.

Catherine A. Gallagher, et alii. 1999. "A Quantitative Review of the Effects of Sex Offender Treatment on Sexual Reoffending." *Corrections Management* Page 8

Quarterly, 3(4), 19-29.

This article reports on an intensive review of a collection of sex offender rehabilitation studies. The studies reviewed encompass a variety of both prison and community-based treatment modalities. The authors attempt to determine which treatment modes have found the greatest support in the literature. They find that cognitive-behavioral treatment approaches have produced the great changes in sex-offender behavior. Chemical and general psychosocial treatment modes show less evidence of success.

Craig Dowden and D.A. Andrews. 1999. "What Works for Female Offenders: A Meta-Analytic Review." *Crime & Delinquency*, 45(4), 438-452. Page 9

This article reports on the results of an intensive review of the relatively sparse body of literature on what works for female offenders. This review concludes that programs guided by the principles of risk, need and responsivity are generally likely to have a positive impact upon recidivism for this population. This study also concludes that more research is needed into the impact of gender specificity on program outcomes.

David B. Wilson, et alii. 1999. "A Quantitative Review and Description of Corrections-Based Education, Vocation, and Work Programs." *Corrections Management Quarterly*, 3(4), 8-18. Page 11

This study reports on the results of an intensive review of the literature on the effectiveness of prison-based education, vocational training and work programs. The authors find that the existing body of evaluation studies are rather poor in quality, and do not lend themselves readily to firm conclusions about these types of programs. The evidence, though, suggests that these programs can have a positive impact on offender success after release from prison.

Research Notes

The following report on the recruitment of correctional employees was authored by Deputy Secretary for Administration John Shaffer, based upon his doctoral dissertation.

John S. Shaffer. 1999. "Life on the Installment Plan: Careers in Corrections." *Corrections Today*, December, 84-86, 88, 147.

This article examines the reasons correctional employees pursue a career in corrections. The author notes that correctional employees have in a sense committed themselves to a prison term, albeit in eight hour installments. Popular perceptions of prison employees are discussed, noting that corrections workers are often viewed as corrupt, power hungry or brutal. The author rejects these popular perceptions, arguing that prison work is often one of the most challenging and difficult professions. Corrections employees must rely upon their interpersonal skills, maturity and judgement to manage an often turbulent inmate population. It is important, then, to understand how and why individuals enter the corrections field. Several factors are explored as motivators for individuals entering and remaining in corrections, including economic security, military orientation, social work motivation and power and control orientation. These motivations are broken down by race, gender, age and other variables. On the whole, individuals choosing a career in corrections seem to be motivated by a desire for economic and career advancement, and by a desire for a structured and formal work environment. A social work motivation also plays a moderate to small role in their career choice. A desire for personal control over others is an insignificant motivator. This article concludes with recommendations for the recruitment and retention of correctional employees, based upon data gathered for the study.

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

Telemedicine Can Reduce Correctional Health Care Costs: An Evaluation of a Prison Telemedicine Network. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

This NIJ-sponsored study evaluated the use and effectiveness of telemedicine in four federal prisons, three of which are in Pennsylvania (USP-Allenwood; FCI-Allenwood; USP-Lewisburg). Telemedicine was tested as an alternative to bringing medical specialists into the correctional facility or to transporting inmates (sometime by air) to regional federal correctional medical centers. These standard mechanisms for responding to inmate medical needs are both costly and disruptive of institutional routines and public safety. Telemedicine can permit corrections officials to access the services of specialists with minimal disruption and cost. The NIJ study found that the use of telemedicine in these four facilities replaced nearly fifty special medical trips for inmates over a one year period, at a cost savings of over \$86,000. The study also found that telemedicine produces better outcomes for inmates, in terms of quicker access to more specialized care and less chance of injury during transportation. The study calculated that a telemedicine system can pay for itself after replacing approximately 1,500 medical consultations, with potential monthly savings of \$14,000 afterwards. The study concludes that telemedicine is a good option for prison systems that want to reduce expenses associated with inmate health care.

Detailed Reviews

Bert Useem and Michael D. Reisig. 1999. "Collective Action in Prisons: Protests, Disturbances and Riots." *Criminology*, 37(4), 735-759.

This article examines the reasons for prison riots and disturbances. The authors test two competing theoretical explanations for riots, using data drawn from over three hundred riots and disturbances. The authors identify a set of factors that seem to contribute to these types of incidents. This piece makes a useful contribution to the literature on prison management, and challenges some commonly held beliefs about prison disturbances.

The authors begin by discussing two common theories used to explain the development of prison riots and other disturbances. The *inmate balance* theory argues that a balance of powers develops over time between inmates and staff in many prisons. Prison administrators and staff concede a certain degree of authority to inmate leaders, in exchange for the support of those leaders in maintaining order and stability within the prison. Privileges are extended to inmates by inmate leaders and prison administrators in exchange for cooperation with the established order. When prison officials try to reclaim authority from inmate leaders and cut back on privileges extended to inmates, there is a backlash on the part of inmates that takes the form of collective action, such as protests and riots. Inmate balance theory, then, attributes inmate collective disturbances to a disintegration of the unwritten contract between inmates and prison officials.

A competing theoretical school of thought is the *administrative control* theory, which argues that riots and other disturbances result from the failure of prison officials to maintain good management practices within the prison. Weak management contributes to alienation among correctional staff and to discontent among inmates, where neither group has any faith in the competence or good intentions of the prison leadership. This situation leads to a lack of concern over security and to the development of illegitimate prison groups (e.g. gangs) that foment rebellion among the general inmate population. Administrative control theory, then, attributes inmate collective disturbances to weak and ineffectual leadership and management within the prison.

The authors argue that existing research on prison riots is not up to the task of discovering the underlying causes of these events. Most riot research examines only those prisons where riots have occurred, attributing the riots to various conditions within the prison. It may be that the same conditions exist in many prisons that have never experienced a riot. Moreover, existing prison riot research focuses too heavily upon "full scale" riots, ignoring lesser disturbances that may portend more serious trouble for the institution.

The authors attempt to remedy this perceived weakness in the existing literature by collecting data from 317 institutions, some of which have not experienced any sort of significant inmate disturbance. They also explore the incidence of various types of disturbances and non-violent protests, in addition to full scale riots. Their study collected data on a range of indicators of inmate climate and managerial practice and quality.

This study found limited support for the inmate balance theory of prison riots. There did not appear to be any significant correlation between attempts to restrict (or "crackdown on") inmate liberties and privileges and subsequent disturbances or riots. There was some evidence that crackdowns were related to inmate non-violent protests.

Administrative control theory seemed to present a much more powerful explanation of prison riots. Specifically, this study found that the following conditions were strongly associated with riots, disturbances and protests: staff esprit de corps/morale, the existence of prohibited inmate groups, the outcome of misconducts issued against inmates and inmate idleness. Prisons that maintained high morale among staff tended to have fewer inmate outbursts. Prisons that controlled the development and power of prison gangs also experienced fewer riots. Prisons that upheld a larger percentage of misconducts experienced fewer inmate uprisings. Finally, prisons that kept inmates engaged in productive work experienced fewer disturbances of any kind. Interestingly, crowding did not emerge as a significant contributor to riots.

The authors conclude that prison riots, disturbances and protests are not so much a function of any "social contract" between inmates and officials, but rather a direct outcome of poor management practices. The authors argue that prisons must maintain a strong esprit de corps amongst staff, must closely monitor illegitimate prison groups, must hold down the number of frivolous misconducts and must provide constructive outlets for inmates' time and energy.

This research appears to be well done, with no major obvious methodological flaws. The results could have been presented in a more organized manner (the reader struggles a bit to follow the threads of the authors' findings and conclusions), but the study does present some interesting and useful insight into catastrophic prison disturbances. Some of the literature reviewed early in this article suggests that this study could have been strengthened by some discussion of the often indeterminate nature of riots. Thus, riots may not always be predictable products of a particular set of prison conditions, but may sometimes arise for reasons that defy logic and analysis. In any event, this piece makes a contribution to our understanding of why riots may occur.

Jeanne B. Stinchcomb. 1999. "Recovering from the Shocking Reality of Shock Incarceration – What Correctional Administrators Can Learn from Boot Camp Failures." *Corrections Management Quarterly*, 3(4), 43-52.

This article reviews the state of research into the effectiveness of correctional boot camps, pointing out that the final decision to continue or close any correctional facility or program will be informed by research, but will ultimately be driven by political and other considerations. Program evaluation can be most valuable after such decisions are made, to the extent that it can direct efforts to strengthen programs that have been judged meritorious.

The author begins by reviewing the body of boot camp evaluation literature. The general conclusion supported by this literature is that boot camps at best have no effect on recidivism, and actually tend to increase recidivism rates in many cases. Many evaluation studies have been critical of the whole military model employed by these camps, arguing that treatment is often sacrificed to the discipline and regimentation that is characteristic of such camps.

In defense of boot camps, the author notes that it is unrealistic to expect such interventions to produce significant changes in offender behavior over the relatively short time periods available to most camps (less than three months in some cases). Moreover, these camps often suffer from goal ambiguity, with no clear consensus on what their primary mission should be (e.g. treatment, discipline and drill, punishment, cost savings, etc.).

The author also points out that no decision to continue or close boot camps will be made solely on the basis of an unfavorable evaluation. Boot camps appeal to many levels of popular and political sentiment. This sentiment will be the primary driving force behind decisions regarding the fate of the camps. Evaluation data can, however, inform attempts to remedy flaws in boot camps and to strengthen components that show particular promise.

Program evaluation can shed particular light on problems that may have occurred during program implementation. In particular, boot camps must establish realistic and clear goals, must adopt mechanisms for selecting the most appropriate inmates and must recruit staff who are committed to the mission of the camp. In addition to careful implementation, boot camp research *strongly suggests* that aftercare is a critical complement to the boot camp model. Aftercare services can ensure that inmates graduating from boot camps have the maximum chance of making a successful transition to the street.

This article makes the case that it is not enough to know how many boot camp inmates succeed or fail. Correctional administrators can benefit from an in-depth examination of the processes and operations of these camps. Evaluation can provide boot camp administrators with valuable information needed to enhance the strengths of the camps. Though this article does not present any new findings on boot camps, it offers a persuasive argument that these camps can make a valuable contribution to corrections, in spite of data which might suggest otherwise.

Clifford A. Butzin, et alii. 1999. "Measuring the Impact of Drug Treatment: Beyond Relapse and Recidivism." *Corrections Management Quarterly*, 3(4), 1-7.

This article makes the case that evaluations of correctional treatment programs often rely too heavily upon a single indicator - recidivism. Other outcomes may also lend valuable insight into whether a program is helping offenders. The authors examine the CREST program against the indicators of recidivism, relapse, employment and income. This research demonstrates the importance of using multiple measures of outcome when evaluating correctional treatment programs.

The authors begin by discussing methods commonly used to evaluate treatment programs. They note that recidivism and relapse are the two most commonly used indicators of program outcome. While these indicators are necessary, they are not sufficient to produce a comprehensive understanding of the effectiveness of a complex correctional intervention such as a therapeutic community (TC). The overall goal of most prison-based TC's is to prepare offenders to make a successful re-adjustment to society, even if they have never previously had a functional social existence. Thus, many TC's are concerned as much with *habilitation* as with re-habilitation. Offenders must be prepared not only to avoid criminal activities, but also to be productive and self-sufficient members of society.

To test the habilitative effects of the CREST TC, the authors examined the social adjustment of three groups of offenders at eighteen months post-release: those who had completed CREST, those who dropped out of CREST, and those who had no exposure to the program. Outcome variables were employment, income (amount and source), and relapse, in addition to re-arrest and reincarceration.

The authors found that offenders who had completed CREST had significantly higher levels of employment and legitimate income than those who had either dropped out of CREST or who never had the program. CREST completers also had significantly lower levels of re-arrest, reincarceration and relapse to drug use than either non-completers or the no-treatment group.

This study also looked more closely at outcomes for individuals from all three groups who did not manage to secure stable employment upon release. The corrections literature has accumulated much evidence that employment is a critical co-variable in the outcomes of ex-offenders. Those who experience prolonged unemployment are thought to be at significantly higher risk for failure than those who secure jobs. The authors found that among subjects with sustained post-release unemployment, those who had completed CREST had significantly lower levels of relapse and criminal activity than those who had dropped out or not participated in CREST. Thus, participation in CREST mitigated the expected negative consequences of unemployment for ex-offenders.

The authors conclude that it is important for program evaluators to look at a wide range of outcome indicators when evaluating treatment interventions, and to examine how these indicators interact with each other. They also conclude that intensive correctional programs such as TC's may have benefits that extend well beyond simple reductions in recidivism.

This study appears to be well done, with no obvious major shortcomings in its design. It supports the conclusion that evaluation must be multi-faceted if it is to tease out the sometimes subtle effects of programming on offenders. This study also makes a valuable contribution to the growing body of

literature on the impact of therapeutic communities.

Agnes L. Baro. 1999. "Effects of A Cognitive Restructuring Program on Inmate Institutional Behavior." *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 26(4), 466-484.

This study examines the effectiveness of a prison-based treatment program from an angle that is often ignored in correctional evaluation research. While most correctional program evaluations tend to focus heavily upon recidivism, this study looks at the impact of cognitive restructuring programming upon inmate institutional behavior and rule compliance. The authors find that inmates who receive these programs have fewer serious rule violations than other inmates. This research reinforces the importance of using multiple measures in correctional program evaluation.

This article begins with a good synopsis of the cognitive behavioral/restructuring approach to prison treatment. The authors note that cognitive restructuring treatment programs have achieved increased prominence in recent years. Canada has adopted cognitive restructuring as its primary approach to prison treatment, and some elements of this approach can be found in most states. The popularity of this approach to treatment derives in large part from a growing body of evaluation literature which finds that these programs produce significant reductions in recidivism.

While the authors acknowledge that recidivism reduction is important, they point out that correctional treatment programs also influence inmate institutional adjustment. It is reasonable to hypothesize that programs that prepare inmates to behave responsibly in the community should also lead them to be less disruptive while still incarcerated. They note that there are very few studies that have directly examined the impact of cognitive restructuring programs on inmate misconducts. Thus, we have an incomplete understanding of the extent to which these types of programs work.

In order to produce a richer understanding of the effectiveness of these programs, the authors gathered data from the Michigan Reformatory, a maximum security state correctional institution which operates the *Strategies for Thinking Productively* (STP) program. The STP is akin to a general life skills program, with two phases. Phase One is an educational component, where participants are taught cognitive restructuring skills. Phase Two is a residential stage, where inmates live in community and practice using the skills learned in the first phase.

The authors collected institutional misconduct data for three groups of inmates: those who completed only the first phase, inmates who spent at least six months in the second phase, and inmates who had no exposure to STP. The total sample size was 141 inmates. Inmate institutional behavior was tracked for one year after their completion of the program.

This study found that inmates who had participated in STP had significantly fewer write-ups for refusal to obey an order, which is the most common infraction at the institution in question. Indeed, approximately 60 percent of the STP inmates had no misconducts for refusal to obey an order during the follow-up year, versus 34 percent of the inmates in the comparison group. Inmates in the Phase II

group had significantly fewer assault misconducts than inmates in the other two groups.

Surprisingly, there were no significant differences between the three groups in the total number of misconducts of all types. Similarly, time in treatment does not *appear* to have a major influence on outcomes; inmates with extensive program exposure do not seem to behave markedly better than inmates with less exposure.

The authors conclude that the STP cognitive restructuring program does contribute to a reduction in behaviors that constitute a serious threat to institutional order, such as assaults and disobedience. Indeed, even a month or two of exposure to the program does seem to encourage inmates to be more compliant with orders issued by institutional staff. This has important ramifications for prison management, as refusal to obey an order is typically the most common misbehavior within prisons. Thus, cognitive restructuring programs may be able to mitigate a costly and common inmate disciplinary problem. Unfortunately, this study does not indicate that such programs can impact a wider range of misconduct.

This study appears to be well done, with no obvious major flaws. It would have been interesting to see detailed data on program impact on other types of key misconducts, such as threatening staff, fighting and extortion. Finer analysis of time in treatment is also called for, as this is often thought to be a key determinant of program impact. This study should be credited, though, with assessing program outcomes against indicators that are important for institutional management.

Catherine A. Gallagher, et alii. 1999. "A Quantitative Review of the Effects of Sex Offender Treatment on Sexual Reoffending." *Corrections Management Quarterly*, 3(4), 19-29.

This research assess and summarizes existing research on the effectiveness of sex offender treatment programs, both within prisons and in the community. Sex offender programs are grouped into seven major categories. The authors find that cognitive behavioral treatment approaches have the best chance of effecting meaningful change in the thinking and behavior of sexually deviant offenders. Perhaps more significantly, this article provides support for the broad conclusion that it is possible to design effective treatment programs for sex offenders.

The authors note that there have been few if any conclusive evaluations of the effectiveness of programs designed to treat sex offenders. Some studies claim that nothing works to rehabilitate such offenders; others find that some programs can have modest effects on relapse and recidivism. On the whole, there seems to be a general reluctance in the evaluation community to pass broad judgement on the effectiveness of such treatment programs.

The authors attempt to resolve some of the confusion surrounding the impact of sex offender treatment by undertaking a meta-analysis of existing studies. A meta-analysis is somewhat like a literature review, albeit much more rigorous. Meta-analysis revisits the actual methods and data of existing studies, applying statistical techniques to arrive at a synthesis of the findings produced by a body of evaluation research.

The authors included in their analysis 25 existing evaluations of sex offender treatment programs, dating back to 1975. They also drew upon an existing meta-analysis. The evaluations included in this study all met methodological criteria established by the authors to determine whether the research design of a given evaluation was adequate to warrant confidence in the findings. The programs evaluated by this body of research fell into seven categories: pure behavioral, augmented behavioral, cognitive behavioral/relapse, cognitive behavioral/other, surgical, chemical, and other psychosocial approaches. Three of these programs focused upon juvenile offenders.

The authors found that surgical castration "treatments" produced a substantial impact upon reoffending. Such treatment is not legal in the United States, and thus this finding is of limited generalizability. Cognitive behavioral treatment approaches were also effective in reducing recidivism, although the effect was moderate. Behavioral and chemical treatment approaches also showed some evidence of effectiveness in treating sex offenders. Augmented behavioral and psychosocial approaches showed less evidence of effectiveness.

The authors conclude from their analysis that the evaluation research literature supports the effectiveness of some approaches to sex offender treatment. Cognitive-behavioral approaches seem to hold the greatest promise for rehabilitating these offenders. Clearly, treatment of sex offenders can produce some reductions in recidivism.

It is telling that the authors were able to identify only 25 valid studies to include in their meta-analysis. The dearth of research into sex offender treatment is the primary limitation to this analysis. It is difficult to arrive at conclusions about the effectiveness of a wide range of treatment programs with such a small body of literature. While it seems clear that sex offenders are amenable to treatment, more study of this treatment is needed for before we can safely identify what works best for this population. This article, though, provides useful insight into what is already known.

Craig Dowden and D.A. Andrews. 1999. "What Works for Female Offenders: A Meta-Analytic Review." *Crime & Delinquency*, 45(4), 438-452.

This article reports on the results of an intensive review of the literature on effective prison-based treatment programs for female offenders. The authors also explore the extent to which treatment based upon criminogenic needs is appropriate for these offenders. This study finds that treatment programs that are guided by the principles of risk, need and responsivity are effective in reducing recidivism rates for female, as well as male, offenders.

The authors note that research into the effectiveness of prison-based treatment over the past two decades has established that such treatment can be effective for some offenders under some circumstances. Much of this research supports a focus upon the principles of risk, need and responsivity in the design and administration of correctional treatment.

The *risk* principle suggests that levels of treatment intervention should be matched to the chance that an offender will fail (e.g. recidivate). Offenders with the greatest chance of failure should receive the

most intensive treatment services. The *needs* principle refers to specific problems that must be addressed in treatment. Studies have identified a set of criminogenic needs thought to contribute to criminal activity, including poor problem solving skills and anti-social associates. Treatment programs targeting these needs have been found to reduce recidivism rates. The *responsivity* principle is concerned with the degree of match between treatment modalities and the learning and cognitive styles of the offenders receiving treatment. Treatment should be presented in a way that will be likely to "sink-in" to offenders. Empirical support exists for cognitive-behavioral and social learning as general approaches to the delivery of treatment.

The authors note that while there is much research on the effectiveness of these principles on general inmate populations, relatively fewer studies have focused upon female offenders. Even fewer studies have attempted to synthesize this research using techniques such as meta-analysis. Meta-analysis is similar to an intensive review of an existing body of research literature, albeit more systematic. In meta-analysis, specific quantitative findings reported in existing studies are statistically aggregated to produce summary conclusions about the effectiveness of an intervention.

The authors undertook a meta-analysis of 26 evaluation studies that focused exclusively or heavily upon female offenders and that reported some measure of recidivism as a dependent variable. Their meta-analysis found support for the use of the principles of risk, needs and responsivity in the treatment of female offenders. The studies included in this meta-analysis reported that the greatest effect sizes (reductions in recidivism) occurred in programs that targeted female offenders at high risk for failure, that focused upon criminogenic needs and that utilized cognitive-behavioral and social learning approaches to treatment. Programs that directly addressed anti-social thinking, poor problem solving, and anti-social associations tended to be the most effective.

Interestingly, programs that targeted substance abuse and educational and employment deficits alone did not achieve significant reductions in re-offending. It may be that absent a criminogenic needs approach to the treatment of these issues, the mere existence of a program for these problems may be insufficient to reduce recidivism. Finally, this meta-analysis did not produce any findings about the effectiveness of programs dealing with past victimization or self-esteem. This study is also unclear about the impact of gender-specificity on treatment outcomes. Thus, additional research is needed into the extent to which programs tailored to the learning and emotional styles of women outperform more generic treatment modalities.

This analysis appears to be well-done, although it suffers from a rather narrow focus upon recidivism as the dependent variable in the treatment programs studied. The correctional literature increasingly indicates that it is important to look at a wide range of outcome indicators when assessing correctional programs. Programs that make inmates more manageable may be valuable even if they have no impact upon recidivism. This study does provide useful insight into the components of effective correctional treatment for female offenders, though, and makes a contribution to a neglected body of literature.

David B. Wilson, et alii. 1999. "A Quantitative Review and Description of Corrections-Based Education, Vocation, and Work Programs." <i>Corrections Management Quarterly</i> , 3(4), 8-18.
--

This article reports on an intensive review of literature on the effectiveness of prison-based work and education programs. This study highlights the difficulty evaluators often have in drawing firm conclusions about the effectiveness of programs. While reductions in recidivism may be found, it is not always clear to what extent the treatment interventions actually contributed to the decrease in re-offending.

The authors begin with a review of prison-based education and work programs, noting that these types of programs are found in the vast majority of U.S. prisons. Educational achievement and employment history are also identified as important contributors to criminal deviance and compliance with social rules. The evidence for the effectiveness of correctional education and work programs, however, is at best unclear. Many of the studies of these programs have utilized weak research designs, and have not employed adequate controls for selection bias. Thus, it is difficult to draw solid conclusions about the impacts of these programs upon recidivism or other outcomes of interest (e.g. institutional adjustment).

The authors undertake a meta-analysis of the existing literature in an attempt to clarify the conflicting body of evaluation literature. Meta-analysis is similar to an intensive review of an existing body of research literature, albeit more systematic. In meta-analysis, specific quantitative findings reported in existing studies are statistically aggregated to produce summary conclusions about the effectiveness of an intervention. The authors identified 33 studies that met the basic methodological criteria for inclusion in such an analysis. Post-secondary and vocational education programs were well represented in these studies, whereas there were few work programs included.

This analysis found that post secondary education, vocational training and work programs seemed to produce the greatest reductions in recidivism, as much 14 percentage points in some cases. The evidence for adult basic education and GED programs was less clear, although it seems that these programs were relatively less effective at reducing recidivism. The work programs that seemed to have the greatest chance of success were those that had multiple components, that taught marketable skills, and that had some provisions for aftercare.

The authors caution that although many of these studies showed some positive impacts upon recidivism, it is not always clear whether this impact resulted from the program or from extraneous factors. Many of the research designs, while adequate, were not strong enough to confidently rule out confounding factors such as selection bias on the part of inmates. Thus, the inmates who participated in these programs may have been motivated to succeed regardless of the type of programming available to them. Moreover, the specific programs included in this study seemed to have been relatively well-integrated and highly intensive, and may not be representative of typical corrections programs. Thus, it is difficult to generalize the results of the evaluation of these programs to other programs that address the same needs.

This study appears to be well done, and offers some evidence that corrections based education and work programs can make a difference in the post-release outcomes of offenders. Much more evaluation is needed, though, before one can safely conclude that these types of programs are

effective. Given the resources dedicated to such programs, further investigation is warranted.

Index to *Research in Review* - Volume 2 - 1999

Evaluation of Treatment

Agnes L. Baro. 1999. "Effects of A Cognitive Restructuring Program on Inmate Institutional Behavior." *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 26(4), 466-484. (Number 4)

Clifford A. Butzin, et alii. 1999. "Measuring the Impact of Drug Treatment: Beyond Relapse and Recidivism." *Corrections Management Quarterly*, 3(4), 1-7. (Number 4)

Craig Dowden and D.A. Andrews. 1999. "What Works for Female Offenders: A Meta-Analytic Review." *Crime & Delinquency*, 45(4), 438-452. (Number 4)

David Farabee, et alii. 1999. "Barriers to Implementing Effective Correctional Drug Treatment

Programs.” *The Prison Journal*, 79(2), 150-162. (Number 3)

Catherine A. Gallagher, et alii. 1999. "A Quantitative Review of the Effects of Sex Offender Treatment on Sexual Reoffending." *Corrections Management Quarterly*, 3(4), 19-29. (Number 4)

Alan T. Harlan, ed. 1996. *Choosing Correctional Options that Work: Defining the Demand and Evaluating the Supply*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. 275pp. (Number 3)

Roger Matthews and John Pitts. 1998. “Rehabilitation, Recidivism, and Realism: Evaluating Violence Reduction Programs in Prison.” *The Prison Journal*, 78(4), 390-405. (Number 1)

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

Graham L. Staines, et alii. 1999. “Sequential Assignment and Treatment-As-Usual: Alternatives to Standard Experimental Designs in Field Studies of Treatment Efficacy.” *Evaluation Review*, 23(1), 47-76. (Number 2)

Jeanne B. Stinchcomb. 1999. "Recovering from the Shocking Reality of Shock Incarceration – What Correctional Administrators Can Learn from Boot Camp Failures." *Corrections Management Quarterly*, 3(4), 43-52. (Number 4)

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

Harry K. Wexler, et alii. 1999. “The Amity Prison TC Evaluation: Reincarceration Outcomes.” *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 26(2), 147-167. (Number 2)

David B. Wilson, et alii. 1999. "A Quantitative Review and Description of Corrections-Based Education, Vocation, and Work Programs." *Corrections Management Quarterly*, 3(4), 8-18. (Number 4)

Health

James W. Marquart, et alii. 1999. “The Implications of Crime Control Policy on HIV/AIDS-Related Risk Among Women Prisoners.” *Crime & Delinquency*, 45(1), 82-98. (Number 1)

Telemedicine Can Reduce Correctional Health Care Costs: An Evaluation of a Prison Telemedicine Network. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice. (Number 4)

Inmate Assessment

Jennifer L. Boothby and Thomas W. Durham. 1999. “Screening for Depression in Prisoners Using the Beck Depression Inventory.” *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 26(1), 107-124. (Number 1)

Scott D. Camp. 1999. "Do Inmate Survey Data Reflect Prison Conditions? Using Surveys to Assess Prison Conditions of Confinement." *The Prison Journal*, 79(2), 250-268. (Number 3)

Kevin S. Douglas and Christopher D. Webster. 1999. "The HCR-20 Violence Risk Assessment Scheme: Concurrent Validity in a Sample of Incarcerated Offenders." *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 26(1), 3-19. (Number 1)

David J. Simourd and Jennifer Van De Ven. 1999. "Assessment of Criminal Attitudes: Criterion-Related Validity of the Criminal Sentiments Scale-Modified and Pride in Delinquency Scale." *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 26(1), 90-106. (Number 1)

Ann Ward and John Dockerill. 1999. "The Predictive Accuracy of the Violent Offender Treatment Program Risk Assessment Scale." *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 26(1), 125-140. (Number 1)

Leadership and Prison Management

Melvin Brown, Jr. and Dan Richard Beto. 1999. "Effective Correctional Leadership for the 21st Century." *Corrections Management Quarterly*, 3(1), 47-51. (Number 1)

Thomas E. Feucht and Andrew Keyser. 1999. "Reducing Drug Use in Prisons: Pennsylvania's Approach." *National Institute of Justice Journal*, October, 10-15. (Number 3)

Mario A. Paparozzi. 1999. "Leadership: An Antidote to Bureaucracy and a Remedy for Public Disheartenment." *Corrections Management Quarterly*, 3(1), 36-41. (Number 1)

John S. Shaffer. 1999. "Life on the Installment Plan: Careers in Corrections." *Corrections Today*, December, 84-86, 88, 147. (Number 4)

Jeremy Travis. 1999. "Viewing Corrections Through a Different Lens." *Corrections Management Quarterly*, 3(1), 30-35. (Number 1)

Harry Wilson and Kathleen Gnall. 1999. "Performance Measures and Strategic Planning for Corrections." *Corrections Compendium*, 24(6), 4-5, 26. (Number 2)

Bert Useem and Michael D. Reisig. 1999. "Collective Action in Prisons: Protests, Disturbances and Riots." *Criminology*, 37(4), 735-759. (Number 4)

Miscellaneous

Wayne N. Welsh, Patricia H. Jenkins and Philip W. Harris. 1999. "Reducing Minority Overrepresentation in Juvenile Justice: Results of Community-Based Delinquency Prevention in Harrisburg." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 36(1), 87-110. (Number 1)

John D. Wooldredge. 1999. "Inmates Experiences and Psychological Well-Being." *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 26(2), 235-250. (Number 2)

Fiona H. Biggam and Kevin G. Power. 1999. "A Comparison of the Problem-Solving Abilities and Psychological Distress of Suicidal, Bullied, and Protected Prisoners." *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 26(2), 196-216. (Number 2)

Parenting Programs

Kathleen J. Block. 1999. "Bringing Scouting to Prison: Programs and Challenges." *The Prison Journal*, 79(2), 269-283. (Number 3)

Robert C. Granger and Rachel Cytron. 1999. "Teenage Parent Programs: A Synthesis of the Long Term Effects of the New Chance Demonstration, Ohio's Learning, Earning, and Parenting Program, and the Teenage Parent Demonstration." *Evaluation Review*, 23(2), 107-145. (Number 2)

Privatization

David Shichor. 1999. "Privatizing Correctional Institutions: An Organizational Perspective." *The Prison Journal*, 79(2), 226-249. (Number 3)

Travis Pratt and Jeff Maahs. 1999. "Are Private Prisons More Cost-Effective than Public Prisons? A Meta-Analysis of Evaluation Research Studies." *Crime and Delinquency*, 45(3), 358-371. (Number 2)

Gilbert Geis, et alii. 1999. "Private Prisons, Criminological Research and Conflict of Interest: A Case Study." *Crime and Delinquency*, 45(3), 372-388. (Number 2)

Sentencing Policy

Dina R. Rose. *Coercive Mobility and Crime: Incarceration and Social Disorganization*. New York: John Jay College of Criminal Justice. (Number 3)

Michael Tonry. 1999. "Parochialism in U.S. Sentencing Policy." *Crime and Delinquency*, 45(1), 48-65. (Number 1)