This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

AN ANALYSIS OF RISK FACTORS
ASSOCIATED WITH PROBATIONER SUCCESS
IN
NEW JERSEY'S INTENSIVE SUPERVISION PROGRAM

presented by

MICHAEL T. COTTS

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

MASTER OF SCIENCE degree in CRIMINAL JUSTICE

Major professor

Date MAY 3, 1996

AN ANALYSIS OF RISK FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH PROBATIONER SUCCESS IN NEW JERSEY'S INTENSIVE SUPERVISION PROGRAM

By

Michael T. Cotts

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Criminal Justice

1996

ABSTRACT

AN ANALYSIS OF RISK FACTORS
ASSOCIATED WITH PROBATIONER SUCCESS
IN
NEW JERSEY'S INTENSIVE SUPERVISION PROGRAM

By

Michael T. Cotts

The purpose of this study was to discern which offender risk factors were most meaningful in the prediction of probationer success (or failure) in an intensive supervision probation (ISP) program. Secondary analyses were performed on a data set from New Jersey's Intensive Supervision program, 1983-1986. Both bivariate and multivariate techniques were utilized using SPSS. Ten risk factors were drawn from four selected risk assessment models. Using contingency table analysis and logistic regression analysis, the findings suggest that employment status, number of prior convictions, number of prior probation or parole revocations, as well as race and sex were meaningful predictors of ISP outcomes. The final logistic regression model correctly predicted 73 percent of ISP probation outcomes.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my gratitude to my thesis committee and its Chair, Dr. Charles Corley for their patience and persistence under the constraints of time. For their technical assistance and expertise, I wish to thank Mr. Brian R. Johnson and Dr. Randall Fotiu. Finally, for her patient support, I give many thanks to my wife Carole.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

Importance of Risk Assessment

The subjective assessment of risk and the prediction of future behavior have always been an integral function of our criminal justice system. The ways in which individuals either suspected or convicted of criminal activity are approached, processed, and adjudicated are often based upon this assessment. Perhaps the most important juncture for accuracy in risk prediction is at the decision to release a convicted offender back into the community. Classical models have been developed to address the risk of future criminal behavior, and the prediction of success or failure in the community under various probation and pretrial release programs. However, the assessment of risk of future criminal behavior based upon past and current circumstances has always been a somewhat elusive endeavor, as science can address and quantify only a finite number of risk factors in an infinite realm of human behavior patterns and settings.

While it is clear that the accurate prediction of potential criminal behavior is a paramount goal for community-based corrections as a social institution, it is also true that this goal carries different weights at different levels of the criminal justice system. Risk assessment will inevitably influence the techniques utilized by law enforcement for apprehension and arrest. The assessment of risk factors for bail and bond consideration issues may differ from sentencing decisions and from the various classification schemes

utilized for those individuals who are placed under supervision in the community or those sentenced to jail or prison.

Accuracy in predicting the risk of future criminal behavior at each level and also in predicting the potential for positive change dictates to a large extent how an offender will be 'processed' in the system, and which sanctions will be imposed, and ultimately may influence the degree of success an individual might attain under such sanctions. The importance of risk assessment can hardly be understated when considering the release of a traditionally prison-bound offender back into the community. Inaccuracy could result in increased expense, as well as increased incidence of recidivism. Models of assessment have been developed and revised, and will be further explored in this thesis. Their merits can only be as good as their predictive successes.

Intensive Supervision Probation (ISP)

Intermediate sanctions are those criminal sanctions that lie between prison confinement and traditional probation. They have been introduced and refined in recent years in response to America's prison overcrowding dilemma. Intermediate sanctions aim to reduce the enormous number of institutional commitments. These sanctions offer to satisfy public desire for the criminal justice system to act as a deterrent to criminal behavior. Several efforts, such as Michigan's Community Corrections Act and other proposals aimed at reducing prison populations nationwide, have left the criminal justice system with the task of identifying the most meaningful risk factors for the acceptance of an offender into the

community. Success and community acceptance of intermediate sanctions as viable alternatives to incarceration depend heavily upon the accurate assessment of risk. By study, application, and change, research efforts assist in identifying those factors which will best predict offender success under available intermediate sanctions.

Perhaps the most popular and widely utilized intermediate sanction in recent years has been Intensive Supervision Probation (ISP). The balance between just-desserts punishment and cost-effective prison-diversion have placed ISP programs in the spotlight as an intermediate sanction. ISP programs have attempted to bridge the gap between retribution, punishment, restitution, and concerns over public safety on one side, and the over-utilization of scarce prison space on the other. Though specific program guidelines and requirements vary from one jurisdiction to another, the basic premise behind ISP programs is to target those individuals who would have been incarcerated under current sentencing guidelines and/or practices, and provide for them an enhanced supervision strategy in the community. As the name infers, the programs are far more intensive in terms of probation supervision, program requirements and personal responsibilities on the part of the probationer than are required under more traditional probation sentences. These 'high-risk' probationers may qualify for ISP either before or after being sentenced to jail or prison.

Purpose of the Study

This study will focus on a specific area of community-based corrections and its population of offenders. Through a review of the literature and a statistical analysis of selected risk variables chosen from New Jersey's Intensive Supervision Program (ISP) an attempt will be made to discern which risk factors represent the best predictors of ISP program success. Success is defined as an unconditional release from ISP supervision having met all program requirements without violation. Failure is defined as a return to prison for either ISP rule violation or a conviction for a new offense. Social, legal, economic, psychological, vocational, and criminal history related variables will be examined as they relate to the success or failure in the New Jersey ISP program. As Latessa (1986) has pointed out: "Indeed one of the problems facing ISP is the dilemma of accurately selecting offenders appropriate for higher levels of supervision in the community." Thus the two-fold purpose of identifying predictive risk factors is first to refine eligibility and ISP selection criterion; and secondly to develop more effective supervision strategies for the probation officer in order to reduce the incidence of offender recidivism.

Potential Impact for Probation Services

The potential impact for the evaluation of risk assessment lies in the decision-making processes at each juncture of ISP service delivery. These junctures include not only initial acceptance into an ISP program, but also involve decisions for the appropriate level,

type, and frequency of supervision, acceptance into various rehabilitative services, and appropriate placements for community service work. The notion of releasing potentially dangerous probationers into our neighborhoods without adequate supervision or community control has been met with concern from the public. Likewise, if ISP is viewed simply as a net-widening sanction, then its efficacy as a true diversion program may be diminished in the criminal justice community. Thus, assessing risk and applying sanctions based upon specific risk factors or variables has the potential to re-shape public opinion, affect the acceptance of community-based corrections, restructure sentencing guidelines and practices, and ultimately reduce prison populations without posing an elevated risk to the safety and security of our streets. If key variables which play a statistically significant role in the success rate of ISP probationers can be pinpointed, then the efforts to focus on these elements to develop an enhanced supervision strategy may be of significant benefit.

Chapter II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Intermediate Sanctions

The term "intermediate sanctions" refers to the range of post-adjudication sanctions being developed to fill the gap between traditional probation and traditional jail or prison sentences. The following excerpt from the opening remarks by Dick Thornburgh, then Attorney General for the United States, to the 1990 National Drug Conference, summarizes a philosophical rationale for intermediate sanctions:

> "...If we recognize the gradations in the seriousness of criminal behavior, then we should have gradations in sanctions as well. That's why we need a portfolio of intermediate punishments that are available--independent of whether our correctional facilities are full or empty, or whether our correctional budgets are lush or lean, or whether our offender populations are increasing or declining." (U.S. Department of Justice, 1990).

This suggested approach to the development of an array of available sanctions is not the historical rationale for their creation. The prevailing thrust behind these alternatives to incarceration has been this nation's prison overcrowding dilemma.

Some of the points made by Michael N. Castle in writing for the National Institute of Justice illustrate and illuminate the problem:

- Nationwide, about 1 in 50 persons is under the control of correctional authorities.

- In the last decade, national per capita expenditures grew 21 percent, but corrections expenditures grew 62 percent.
- The nation's prison population essentially doubled during the 1980's to more than 600,000 people.
- The growth of America's prison population is over ten times that of the general population.

Accomplishing change and overcoming public resistance to alternatives to incarcerating a felony population means putting an end to the old-fashioned and inaccurate concept that criminal justice means prisons and only prisons (Castle, 1991).

Clearly, our nationwide problem of prison crowding underscores the need for more intermediate sanctions, including more effective probation supervision (Clear and O'Leary, 1984). By expanding sentencing options, intermediate sanctions enable the criminal justice system to tailor punishment more closely to the nature of the crime and the offender. An appropriate range of punishments makes it possible to hold offenders appropriately accountable for their actions. (Gowdy, 1991). The range of intermediate sanctions includes, but is not limited to, the use of shock incarceration (boot camp), frequent drug testing, electronic monitoring, intensive supervision probation, house arrest and home confinement with or without electronic monitoring, day reporting centers, expanded use of fines and restitution, community service, and mandatory driver's license suspension. Offender selection for any one of these sanctions is based upon that individual's risk of recidivism or potential for success in the community.

Intensive Supervision Overview

In the last twenty-five years, the role of probation in the field of corrections has changed. It has been challenged to become the core correctional process for most offenders (Clear and Shapiro, 1986). It is no secret that across the country, probation has a serious image problem. Thomas Callahan, Director of Probation in New York State, puts the problem in the vernacular: "People think that probation is soft on crime." (Gettinger, 1983).

There is also no question that probation departments are dealing with a population that is involved in more predatory, destructive, and dangerous criminal activity than at any other time in probation's history (Cochran, 1988). In order to maintain, and in some cases restore its credibility as a pervasive social institution, probation must amount to more than a suspended sentence, with the probation officer reading monthly postcards from hundreds of clients. Gettinger (1983) has asserted that making probation tough on crime should be the primary goal of Intensive Supervision programs, and that intensive supervision is what probation is supposed to be. ISP programs are proliferating at a tremendous pace in the wake of court-mandated solutions to prison crowding, increasing numbers of felony offenders sentenced to probation, and increased public demand that probation agencies be held accountable for these offenders.

Results of early evaluations seem to indicate the appeal of ISP. Budget-conscious policy-makers, offenders who would otherwise be

incarcerated, the public concerned for its safety, courts in search of viable sentencing alternatives, and corrections officials for whom ISP offers an increased measure of credibility, all find in ISP a potential solution to the concern for criminal justice accountability.

Most ISP programs are premised on the assumption that certain high-risk/high-needs offenders can be handled more effectively through an enhanced community supervision strategy. (Cochran, Corbett, and Byrne, 1986). The overall purpose of ISP programs is to protect the community in a cost-effective manner by providing supervision via surveillance, and appropriate services for offenders who, without such high-accountability direction, may be incarcerated by a state's department of corrections.

Though many ISP programs differ in design, implementation, and administration, most share many common characteristics in pursuit of a more effective correctional sanction than regular probation has traditionally provided.

The following discussion addresses the most common elements of most ISP programs. It is certainly not an exhaustive or exclusive listing of all features of all programs, but does address those aspects which lay the groundwork for the majority of existing programs. Unfortunately, "Intensive Supervision" is a "catch-all" phrase which includes a wide range of programs at distinct decision points in the criminal justice system. It has been used alternately to describe programs which function as 1) a front-end alternative to incarceration (both in the form of a discretionary sentencing decision controlled by a judge and as an established presumptive term for a particular offense); 2) as a form of probation case

management, once offenders are placed on regular probation caseloads; and 3) as a "back-door" early release mechanism from prison or jail (Byrne, 1986). The "front door" approach of implementing ISP conditions on those individuals either already placed on probation, or those eligible for regular probation, has come under fire for simply widening the net of social control. It has been criticized as simply implementing yet another social control mechanism on those who are already in the community. It is contended that too many alternative programs have served merely as add-ons to regular probation sentences (Austin and Krisberg, 1982). If ISP is to be viewed as a true diversion program, its offender makeup should be of those individuals either sentenced or committed to jail or prison. The problem, then, on which subsequent discussions in this thesis will focus, is targeting those individuals who are truly prison bound. Clear and Shapiro (1986) suggest that once a "true prison" group is eliminated because of crime seriousness and risk, the incarceration bound offenders left come from a group of offenders whose characteristics suggest the probability of incarceration is only about 50 percent (Clear et al., 1986). Thus, only those "back door" programs which serve to release incarcerated offenders or intercept commitment to jail or prison can escape the criticism of net-widening considerations.

Program Characteristics

Intensive supervision as a concept is fairly straightforward. One might expect that a probation officer would have a much higher degree of control over an individual in the community through

heightened surveillance and frequent interactive contacts. Towards the ends of reducing and eliminating criminal behavior on the part of an individual convicted of illegal activity, the monitoring of the present behavior of each individual is intensified. Most programs require a minimum of five weekly face-to-face contacts between the ISP officer and probationer, with strict enforcement of an evening curfew. Some program designs incorporate a probation officer to coordinate services and report to the court, and a para-police surveillance officer to work in the field, on the street, making contacts and enforcing curfews. Due to the intensity and frequency of officer/offender contacts and interactions, caseload sizes vary from as few as ten, to a maximum of fifty probationers, with twenty-five being the target caseload for many programs. Most involve frequent random drug and/or alcohol testing in the field to determine whether an individual is using or abusing controlled substances. If substance abuse is an issue, then professional and consistent treatment regimens are required for the probationer, including up to daily Alcoholics/Narcotics Anonymous (AA/NA) support group attendance. Professional intervention, counseling, therapy, group therapy, educational or didactic sessions for anger control, sex offender issues, domestic violence, and gambling problems may all be required for the probationer. One may note that these things have traditionally been included as part of regular probation requirements. The difference is the intensified degree of accountability on the part of the probationer to the supervising officer and ultimately to the court. By design, the deterrent effect of having an officer so closely monitoring one's daily activities and

holding one so strictly accountable for all behaviors should have its most profound success due to the nature of the intensity. In terms of sanctions and penalties, most ISP programs require heavy supervision fees along with fines and costs per statute for the offense committed. Often, monetary restitution to victims is required. Hence, an offender is required to seek and maintain gainful employment and/or complete job skills training, and frequently must complete a minimum of up to hundreds of hours of community service work as well.

Fiscal Considerations

From a fiscal standpoint, intermediate sanctions including ISP are quite attractive to state and local budget reformers and policy makers. Most are extraordinarily cost-effective when compared to per capita prison commitment costs. Some estimates cite approximately $16,000 per year to house a prisoner in a minimum security camp or prison and $5,000 to provide intensive supervision in the community, including $3,000 for the purchase of support services such as substance abuse treatment. It is estimated that if the State of Michigan could intensively supervise the 1,200 parolees and 2,400 probationers in the community who are currently going to prison, the state could avoid building three additional prisons at a capital outlay cost of $125 million and an annual operating cost of $48 million. This compares with the cost of $18 million for ISP for those 3,600 offenders (Michigan Criminal Justice Roundtable, 1995). Likewise, ISP programs in Oregon, Colorado, and New Jersey have all shown very attractive cost benefit analyses. Evaluators of

Georgia's ISP program have cited an average cost of $695 per offender during their program period, compared to $25,215 per offender had the offender been incarcerated (Latessa, 1986). Pearson (1990) in his evaluation of New Jersey's ISP program estimated costs at $7,000 per offender year, while prison costs were roughly $17,000 per offender year during 1986. Hence, with current cost of imprisonment running between $20,000 and $30,000 per offender per year, and the costs for new facilities running to $100,000 per bed, it is not surprising that many criminal justice professionals are both optimistic and enthusiastic about the possibilities of ISP.

The Question of who is eligible for an alternative sanction when faced with a possible sentence to confinement on a criminal conviction is a problematic issue. Offender eligibility and specific release criterion are key issues which must be explored in depth if ISP is going to be effective in its overall goals of being cost-effective, reducing prison populations, and satisfying the growing concern for public safety. Pinpointing those risk conditions, variables, or factors which contribute to ISP probationer success or failure is an essential function of sentencing alternatives research. Target populations are quite difficult to accurately and consistently define. Those most frequently accepted into ISP are those felons who have committed property crimes, theft, fraud, and/or drug offenses. Almost universally excluded are cases of homicide, rape, and violent or aggravated crimes. It is asserted that the primary aim of classification systems and risk assessment instruments is to enhance supervision effectiveness in the community (Smith, Rhine, and Jackson, 1989).

Risk Assessment Overview

The previous discussions on the philosophical, fiscal, and social rationales for ISP programs as well as the general overview of basic program structure has given rise to what must clearly be one of the most critical aspects of ISP and all community-based corrections: that is the appropriate selection of an offender population for such programs. If the Criminal Justice system, as part of a larger society deems it necessary to divert a traditionally prison bound offender into a community, then the social as well as the specific research question emerges: "Which individual risk factors are to be given most weight, not only for an initial acceptance into an ISP program, but also to focus on who is likely to be successful under intensive supervision?" Several states have developed models for risk and needs assessment for screening offenders for appropriate services, sanctions, and levels of community supervision. But while various labels are used to differentiate between levels of supervision, most are essentially restatements of the traditional Maximum/Medium/Minimum supervision classes (Nelson, Ohmart, and Harlow, 1978).

Risk assessment and the scientific prediction of success in the community can be divided into two broad categories: Clinical methods and Statistical methods. The clinical approach considers social, personality, and situational variables and the interactions of these variables as the most essential elements of prediction. A high degree of expertise is required to interpret such highly subjective and personal elements. Simon (1971) indicated that reliability was a major problem of clinical prediction due to variation, the clinician

day by day, or clinician to clinician. She also indicated that the use of mechanical data collection could be regulated by a specific set of rules.

By contrast, statistical methods utilize mathematical formulas to produce probability estimates of future behavior. Information about an offender is compared with similar information on a large sample of individuals whose behavior in similar situations is known (Klofas, Stojkovic, and Kalinich, 1990). Statistical methods are generally regarded as the more reliable and accurate for the prediction of future criminal behavior. Sophisticated multivariate models are most often employed to account for similarities and differences in selected variables.

Four specific models of risk and needs assessment will be examined in the following discussion. They are simplified overviews of the assessment and/or classification models utilized by the respective agencies in A) Wisconsin, B) Oregon, C) Colorado, and D) New Jersey.

The purpose of integrating the research efforts of each of these projects is to compare the specific risk factors and variables which were deemed most important in each model.

The Wisconsin Model

One of the most widely recognized and utilized risk assessment tools is the Wisconsin risk assessment paradigm. In the fall of 1977, an elaborate research project at a cost of more than one million dollars was undertaken in Wisconsin. The Wisconsin department of Corrections developed a classification system to

assess a probationer's propensity for further criminal conduct and assign them to different levels of supervision. The project was considered the most methodologically rigorous caseload study conducted in years, and the assessment of risk and needs had a significant influence on respective probationer outcomes. The Wisconsin system, also known as the NIC system, was also effective in predicting success or failure in completing probation terms--low risk cases were revoked at a much lower rate than the high risk ones (Zhang and DeLaPaz, 1990). Classification or risk criterion in the Wisconsin Model are as follows: 1) Address changes in the past 12 months (the fewer changes of address reflect more stability in the community); 2) Percentage of time employed in the past 12 months (the more time employed, the more stability and responsibility shown); 3) Alcohol usage problems; 4) Other drug usage problems (drug and alcohol involvement may warrant professional intervention and treatment to establish a chemical-free lifestyle); 5) Attitude (an individual motivated toward success is expected to fare better than one who is generally unmotivated, angry, or displays a poor attitude); 6) Age at first conviction (The lower the age, the higher the risk, based upon the potential length of time in criminal involvement); 7) Prior periods of probation or parole supervision; 8) Number of prior probation or parole revocations (the greater the number of unsuccessful experiences under community supervision, the greater the risk of program failure); and 9) Number of prior felony convictions (the greater the number, the higher the risk of failure).

Each of these variables is given a score based upon the offender's criminal and social history. A raw score, a single number,

is calculated from the individual's scores on each variable. That number, in turn, gives the assessor and/or Judge a fair idea of how much risk the offender poses to the community once released on probation.

The Oregon Model

Beginning in 1984, the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation funded the Probation Development Project (PDP) in Multnomah County, Oregon. Its two main objectives were first to develop a probation unit which was capable of providing enhanced supervision of offenders, and second to reform sentencing practices to reduce the overall number of commitments to jail or prison. A series of research tasks were undertaken to produce a plan for identifying offenders for supervision. Researchers utilized a random sample of felony offenders sentenced in Multnomah County within a specified time frame. All variables in the screening model which was developed resulted from multiple regression analysis of the probation sample based on prediction of "failure". A total of 28 percent of the cases in the sample were failures. Multiple regression analysis was used because research suggests that there is little difference between this technique and other, more elaborate methods of building prediction models (Gottfredson and Gottfredson, 1984). A straightforward regression analysis of the subsample produced the following variables. The criterion variable was a success/failure dichotomy: 1)Substance use; 2)Juvenile convictions; 3)Needs at closing (an offender's rehabilitative, vocational, and educational needs are assessed; the higher the

degree of need, the higher the risk of failure); 4) Harm to victim (greater degrees of physical and/or emotional harm may indicate greater risk of failure); 5) Prior probation or parole revocations; and 6) Age at first conviction.

Researchers did go on to note that after investigating the issue of racial bias, they learned that ethnicity was not significantly correlated with this scale. Interestingly, offense type was dropped, as in no instance did it play a significant role in a client's eventual performance. Thus, they were dropped from the final models. Once the significant risk variables were codified, the individual was given a raw "risk score". Raw scores then formed the Y-axis against the X-axis of instant crime seriousness (as developed by the Oregon parole board) forming a matrix displaying the percentages of cases sentenced to probation by risk and crime seriousness. If an offender is drawn from a program-eligible pool based upon risk assessment, a standard presentence report (PSI) is prepared by the staff of a diagnostic unit. If regular probation is about to be recommended by the PSI writer, the case is not considered eligible by the PDP unit. If the standard PSI results in a recommendation to an incarcerative term, the case is forwarded to the PDP unit for consideration. A recommendation to the program is then drafted for the sentencing judges' consideration.

The Colorado Model

Similarly, the Colorado ISP program utilizes a sentencing matrix. The purpose of the matrix is to identify prison-bound felons who remain eligible for probation under Colorado statute. The use of the

matrix, which is administered by probation officers, increases the uniformity of the officers' sentencing recommendations to the court. Risk factors or variables which are given weight in the Colorado matrix are similar to those outlined in the previous models and include: 1)Juvenile adjudications; 2) Juvenile commitments (indicating a crime severity to warrant some term of incarceration); 3) Prior felony convictions; 4) Prior violent felony convictions; 5) Adult probation revocations; and 6) Prior parole revocations (the two revocation status's are separated in this model, with the heavier risk of failure given to parole revocations).

As in the previous model, these weights are calculated for the individual's criminal and social history and a raw score is assigned. Based upon these risk criterion, the referring officer presents information on the case including the matrix recommendation, and any other relevant facts. a final recommendation to the court is made by a probation officer prior to sentencing.

The New Jersey Model

Finally, in his elaborate evaluation of New Jersey's Intensive Supervision Program, Pearson (1990) used a stepwise regression analysis to assess offender risk to recidivate in his comparison of an ISP group with an ordinary term of imprisonment control group. The variables of significance in this study were: 1) Instant offense type (ranking for risk purposes from violent felony to property offense misdemeanor); 2)Prior felony charges; 3) Race (Hispanic and black having a higher failure rate than white non-Hispanic); 4) Employment/unemployment; 5) Educational attainment (the higher

level of attainment, the lower the risk of failure); and 6) Age at time of instant offense (the lower the age, the higher the risk score).

It should be noted here that in contrast to the first three models, Pearson's variables of significance were used to compare recidivism and success rates between groups, and not to determine who may be eligible for the ISP program. Actual offender selection is made by a panel of judges who resentence low-risk felons who have served a minimum of three to four months in prison on their original sentence. An evaluation of the program's effectiveness, including both ongoing monitoring and comparisons between ISP participants and a sample of similar felony offenders who served their terms and were paroled, shows that ISP has been successful in meeting its objectives. ISP saved prison space, reduced per offender correctional costs, produced a high-rate (93.3 percent) level of employment among participants, and reduced recidivism rates by over 10 percent.

These four models of risk assessment were chosen for their unique and contrasting approaches to predicting success. The Oregon Model's variables seem to be overall more socially oriented, whereas the Colorado Model uses a "rap sheet" approach, looking at criminal history almost exclusively as its basis of prediction of future criminality and appropriateness for supervision in the community. The Wisconsin and New Jersey Models contain trappings of both social and criminal history styles for their respective predictive utilities.

In terms of assessment of risk of future criminality, it would seem appropriate that an eclectic approach be used. Personal, social,

and clinical issues alone have been viewed as insufficient for purposes of prediction. Likewise, a "black and white" criminal record leaves many life and potential success issues unexplored. It is the marriage of both social and legal circumstances and individual variables which should give rise to the most comprehensive picture available when looking at an offender's overall propensity to recidivate or to be successful in the community under intensive supervision.

There is some debate as to whether risk assessment results should be presented to judges as part of presentence information, or be used as a case management tool after a decision has been made as to the appropriateness of an ISP sanction. There is no single standard which can be established, since the philosophy (e.g., just desserts, risk control, rehabilitation) and the purpose (sentencing alternative, case management, prison crowding release valve, etc.) of ISP programs vary from state to state, and within some states as well (Byrne, 1986). Perhaps a combination of uses, for sentencing, case management, and even ISP release eligibility might be an appropriate approach for ISP refinement.

Chapter III
METHODOLOGY

Problem Statement

Toward developing an enhanced supervision strategy for offenders in the community to reduce prison populations without posing an elevated crime risk to the public, offender risk factors must be analyzed to determine which felony offenders are most appropriate for release. Statistical analysis will discern which risk factors are most salient in the prediction of success as defined by unconditional graduation from New Jersey's ISP program.

Description of Data Set

The selected variables have been drawn from the study conducted by Pearson (1990). A general discussion of the characteristics of the ISP participants chosen for supervision will follow, and a more detailed description of each selected variable is found in Appendix A.

The most serious of the crimes for which the ISP participants received their instant sentence to prison was typically the distribution of illegal drugs (43 %) or burglary (23 %), together comprising most of the ISP caseload. About two-thirds of the ISP participants had at least one felony conviction before their instant sentence conviction. About half of them had two or more prior felony convictions. Approximately 30 percent of them served at least one sentence of incarceration of more than thirty days before their instant offense.

Ninety percent of those accepted into the ISP program were male. About 58 percent were white, 32 percent were black, and nine percent Hispanic. These percentages are roughly what we might expect to find in minimum security prisons in the United States as a whole (Pearson, 1987). About half of those accepted into ISP had neither a high school diploma or G.E.D. About 28 percent of them were unemployed at the time of their sentencing for their instant offense. According to presentence report data, 57 percent had a drug problem, and 29 percent had an alcohol problem. In eight percent of the cases, a member of their family was noted in the presentence report as having a criminal record. These facts suggest that the ISP caseload is reasonably typical of the less-serious, less violence-prone prison inmates in the United States (Pearson, 1990).

Selection of Variables

Based upon the previous discussions on the rationales and the general acceptance of the risk variables in the preceding models, the independent variables including basic demographic characteristics which will be analyzed for their predictive utility in this study are listed below.

- SEX
- RACE
- OFFENDER'S LIVING SITUATION IN THE COMMUNITY
- EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT SENTENCE
- DRUG DEPENDENCE PROBLEM
- ALCOHOL DEPENDENCE PROBLEM

- EDUCATION COMPLETED
- NUMBER OF PRIOR CONVICTIONS
- NUMBER OF TIMES ON PROBATION/PAROLE
- NUMBER OF PROBATION/PAROLE REVOCATIONS

These variables represent offender factors drawn from the literature which may lead to more effective supervision strategies once they take their respective places in a scheme of predictive accuracy and strength.

Contingency Table Analysis

The Chi-squared evaluation of contingency tables is an especially useful analytical device (Kachigan, 1986). Each independent variable is crossed with the dependent variable in order to assess the frequencies for ISP graduation and return to prison within the parameters of the risk factor in question. Findings are graphically plotted in 2 x 2 or 2 X k tables with the chi-squared figure within the appropriate degree of freedom (dF) given. Phi values as well as Spearman's Rho values are presented as indicators of the strength of association between each independent variable and its respective outcome.

Regression Analysis/Logistic Regression

Regression analysis is a general method of analyzing much behavioral research data. Its established utility in the assessment of the relative degree to which predictor variables account for variance in a criterion (dependent) variable makes regression

analysis a desirable method for this study. When using a dichotomous dependent variable (successful/unsuccessful ISP) it is preferred to use a non-linear logit regression model (Knapp, Kostas, and Missiakoulis, 1982). The categorical and continuous predictive variables as they take their place in the research question "To what degree is variable X significant to successful ISP completion?" have been collapsed and re-coded where possible for purposes of analysis (refer to Appendix A).

Simply stated, the analysis of the available data will determine which risk factors are the strongest predictors of success in New Jersey's ISP program. The selection of the independent variables from the available data is based upon the previous discussion on the value of using both criminal history and personal/social histories. The dependent variable in the equation will be successful/unsuccessful completion of ISP probation as defined by the ISP data values of either A) graduated, or B) returned to prison.

Chapter IV

FINDINGS/RESULTS

Contingency Table Analysis

In the following discussion each independent variable is displayed in a contingency table (2 X 2 or 2 X k). Raw numbers are shown in each cell with their respective percentages in parentheses. The dependent variable remains consistent throughout as Graduated or Returned to prison. The appropriate chi-square values and association measurement statistics are discussed for each of the variables.

Table 1 shows the contingencies for the variable SEX. A larger percentage of women admitted to the ISP program successfully completed the program. 69 percent of the women were discharged successfully from the program. 57 percent of the men graduated successfully. The chi-square Value of 2.25 at the .13 level of significance does not indicate a particularly significant difference between the sexes, nor does the Phi value of .069 indicate a meaningful level of association between SEX and success or failure.

Table 1

Graduated or Returned to prison by SEX

	Male	Female
Returned	179 (43%)	15 (31)
Graduated	242 (57)	33 (69)

Chi-Square=2.255 DF=1 Significance=.13314
Phi Value=.06935 Significance=.13314

In the assessment of RACE as it relates to the incidence of graduation from ISP, the chi-square value of 19.22 with a .00001 level of significance indicates a strong significance for the RACE variable. The Non-white cell reflects black, Hispanic, and all other orientations. Table 2 shows that 67 percent of white ISP participants graduated, while 47 percent of all non-white races did likewise. A Phi value of .20 however, indicates only a weak to moderate measure of association between graduation and RACE.

Table 2

Graduated or Returned to prison by RACE

	Non-White	White
Returned	105 (53%)	89 (33)
Graduated	93 (47)	182 (67)

Chi-Square=19.226 DF=1 Significance=.00001
Phi Value=.20247 Significance=.00001

Table 3 illustrates that in terms of an offender's living situation in the community, the highest levels of success in ISP are for those individuals living either with spouse and child or one or the other. 62 percent of those who live either alone or with a sibling were successful. Those probationers living with friends and those living with parent and sibling each had roughly a 50 percent chance of success in the program. The Chi-square value of 19.05 at the .00077 level reveals that an offender's living situation is indeed significant. However, the Phi value at .20158 demonstrates a rather weak association between each living situation in this categorical variable and graduation from ISP.

Table 3

Graduated or Returned to prison by LIVING SITUATION IN COMMUNITY

	Friends	Parent/ Sibling	Alone/ Sibling	Spouse or Child	Spouse and Child
Returned	16 (52%)	114 (49)	22 (38)	14 (29)	28 (27)
Graduated	15 (48)	116 (51)	36 (62)	35 (71)	73 (73)

Chi-Square=19.057 DF=4 Significance=.00077
Phi Value=.20158 Significance=.00077

Data on an offender's employment status at the time of sentence was gathered and is presented in Table 4. Nearly 70 percent of those with full-time employment at the time of their sentence were successful in ISP. By contrast, a full 63 percent of those individuals who were unemployed or unable to work were returned to prison for failure in the program. These figures must be viewed with caution, as they represent employment status at sentence, and not necessarily status at the time of program failure. This fact is noteworthy here, as unemployment represents the variable with the highest probability for Returned to prison in the multivariate analysis which will be discussed in the next section. There is an extraordinary significance level at .00000 for this variable, with the chi-square value at 40.5 with 2 degrees of freedom. Spearman's Rho value is used as a measure of association for this ordinal variable, and its value of .285 would indicate a slight to moderate association between employment and successful

completion of the ISP program. The relationship at the .00077 level does however show statistical significance.

Table 4

Graduated or Returned to prison by EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT SENTENCE

	Not Employed	Part Time Job Student	Full time Job
Returned	88 (63%)	19 (40)	87 (31)
Graduated	51 (37)	29 (60)	195 (69)

Chi-Square=40.513 DF=2 Significance=.00000
Rho Value=.28490 Significance=.00000

Drug and alcohol dependence problems and their respective rates of success and failure are outlined in Table 5 and Table 6. In each table, an offender's likelihood of being returned to prison or graduating successfully from ISP is fairly evenly split for those with dependence problems. For drugs, a 55 percent success rate; for alcohol, a 51 percent success rate. For those without drug habits, a 64 percent success rate is realized. For those not diagnosed alcohol dependent, 62 percent were successful. Given these splits, it follows that the respective Chi-square values are significant only at .035 and .029 levels, with very slight association values on the Phi statistic.

Table 5

Graduated or returned to prison by DRUG DEPENDENCE PROBLEM

	Drug Problem	No Problem
Returned	124 (45%)	70 (36)
Graduated	149 (55)	126 (64)

Chi-square=4.432 DF=1 Significance=.03527
Phi Value=.09721 Significance=.03527

Table 6

Graduated or Returned to prison by ALCOHOL DEPENDENCE PROBLEM

	Alcohol Problem	No Problem
Returned	72 (49%)	122 (38)
Graduated	76 (51)	199 (62)

Chi-square=4.730 DF=1 Significance=.02964
Phi Value=.10043 Significance=.02964

In terms of an offender's level of educational attainment, Table 7 indicates a clear and significant correlation between educational attainment and success in the ISP program. Those who dropped out of High School had less than a 50 percent success rate, as opposed to those individuals with higher levels of attainment such as High School graduation or GED completion, which shows a 68 percent success rate, and the highest levels of attainment (some college or college degree) reaching a 74 percent level of successful completion of the program. The Spearman's Rho value approaching .24 would indicate a slight to moderate degree of association between levels of attainment and ISP graduation in this categorical variable. The first category (other) is a result of the collapsing of the other four categories and represents a small number of odd combinations of partially completed educational endeavors at various levels.

Table 7

Graduated or Returned to prison by EDUCATION COMPLETED

	Other	HS Dropout	HS Grad/ GED	Some College/ VocTech	BA,BS PostGrad
Returned	3 (60%)	126 (52)	38 (32)	22 (26)	5 (26)
Graduated	2 (40)	115 (48)	81 (68)	63 (74)	14 (74)

Chi-Square=27.098 DF=4 Significance=.00002
Rho Value=.23702 Significance=.00000

As has been demonstrated in the risk assessment models discussed earlier, one of the most salient risk evaluation factors is an offender's criminal history as indicated by his or her number of prior criminal convictions. Table 8 displays the raw numbers and their corresponding percentages of those ISP participants who were successful in relation to their criminal conviction records. An inverse proportion is clearly identified in this continuous variable by a Rho value of -.32316. Those individuals with no prior convictions enjoyed the highest level of success at 76 percent, followed by those with a single criminal conviction at 66 percent. ISP participants with two, three, or four convictions, comprising roughly 30 percent of the ISP population had nearly an equal split between success and failure rates with 56, 47, and 47 percent successful, respectively. Those with five prior convictions showed the poorest success level at only 18 percent. Table 8 shows that those with six or more convictions, comprising nine percent of the total ISP population had an overall success rate of just 34 percent.

Table 8

Graduated or Returned to prison by NUMBER OF PRIOR CONVICTIONS

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6+
Returned	35 (24)	33 (34)	31 (44)	21 (53)	17 (53)	14 (82)	43 (66)
Graduated	111 (76)	65 (66)	40 (56)	19 (47)	15 (47)	3 (18)	22 (34)

Chi-Square=58.268 DF=16 Significance=.00000
Rho=.32316 Significance=.00000

Likewise, a nearly universal criminal history factor which is shown to be nearly as significant as the number of prior convictions is an individual's number of times he or she has been placed on probation as a matter of sentence. The strongest inverse relationship between the numbers of probation terms is shown by a Spearman's Rho value of -.27158. The significance level is also meaningful at .00015. Table 9 shows that those ISP participants who never served any term of probation or parole had the highest overall success rate at 73 percent, followed downward in success rates by those who had served one, two, three, and four terms or probation or parole with success rates at 57, 46, 42, and 31 percent, respectively. Those with five prior terms graduated at a 44 percent rate, and those with six or more prior terms of probation or parole which comprised only five percent of the total ISP population graduated at a rate of just 35 percent.

Table 9

Graduated or returned to prison by NUMBER OF TIMES ON PROBATION/PAROLE

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6+
Returned	53 (27)	59 (43)	32 (54)	21 (58)	9 (69)	5 (56)	15 (65)
Graduated	140 (73)	78 (57)	27 (46)	15 (42)	4 (31)	4 (44)	7 (35)

Chi-Square=39.705 DF=13 Significance=.00015
Rho Value=.27158 Significance=.00000

Table 10, which shows success and failure rates by the number of prior probation or parole revocations, demonstrates a similar inverse relationship with a comparable Rho value at -.21885 and significance at .00015. 64 percent of those ISP participants who had never had a probation or parole term revoked were successful in ISP. Conversely, those with four or more revocations, comprising just one percent of the ISP population, were returned to prison from the program at a 100 percent failure rate.

Table 10

Graduated or Returned to prison by NUMBER OF PROBATION/PAROLE REVOCATIONS

	0	1	2	3	4+
Returned	139 (36%)	37 (62)	7 (34)	5 (83)	6 (100)
Graduated	244 (64)	21 (38)	9 (56)	1 (17)	0

Chi-Square=28.991 DF=7 Significance=.00015
Rho Value=.21885 Significance=.00000

Multivariate Analysis

To further understand the impact of the aforementioned variables (sex, race, living situation, employment status, drug problem, alcohol problem, education level, number of prior convictions, number of times on probation or parole, and number of probation or parole revocations) a multivariate statistical technique was introduced. Logistic regression was employed to assess the impact of each independent variable in the larger scheme of all of these variables on ISP graduation. As indicated in Chapter 3, logistic regression is well suited to many kinds of data frequently found in sociological research. So many of the dependent variables of interest are dichotomous in nature, while many of the independent variables impacting on them are measured at other levels (Walsh, 1987). The variables in this study are set up in just this way. The dependent variable, Graduated or Returned to prison, has a dichotomous coding of 1 and 0 for their respective outcomes. The coding schemes for the ten independent variables, which have been enumerated in previous discussions, are shown in Appendix A.

The data displayed in Table 11 is the result of a stepwise logistic regression analysis run in SPSS for Macintosh PC version 6.1. The tabular results shown are displayed in rank order based upon the weight of the Beta value of each variable. The reader will note that for the categorical variables (employment status, educational attainment, and living situation) the SPSS program, in building this predictive odds model, selected one category from each of these

Table 11
Stepwise Logistic Regression

Variables in the Equation

Variable	B	S.E.	Sig	R
Unemployed/Unable	-.7256	.1835	.0001	-.1473
Live w/ Friends	-.6785	.3882	.0804	-.0410
HS Dropout	-.4192	.3012	.1640	.0000
Live Alone/Sib	-.3457	.1902	.0691	-.0456
Num Prior Revocations	-.3761	.1749	.0315	-.0646
Num Prior Convictions	-.1589	.0414	.0001	-.1424
HS Grad	-.1010	.9733	.9173	.0000
Live w/ Parent/Sib	-.0415	.2800	.8822	.0000
Some Coll/VocTech	.2238	.3345	.5034	0000
Full Time Employment	.2869	.2413	.2346	.0000
College/PostGrad	.3950.	.3548	.2655	.0000
Live w/ Spouse/Child	.4867	.3181	.1260	.0233
Race	.7746	.2239	.0005	.1260
Sex	1.1430	.4180	.0062	.0934
Constant	.4292	.3462	.2151	

Variables Not in the Equation

Variable	Score	DF	Sig	R
Alcohol Dep Prob	.1102	1	.7399	.0000
Drug Dep Prob	1.8912	1	.1690	.0000
Times on Probation	.1202	1	.7288	.0000

variables and incorporated this into the constant. Each independent variable was run in the deviation contrast mode, pitting it against each of the other variables in the equation. The program internally selected those variables which were deemed significant in relation to the others, and excluded those which were not (alcohol problem, drug problem, and number of times on probation or parole). As is

the case with multiple regression, the contribution of individual variables in logistic regression is difficult to determine. In the contrast mode presented, the contribution of each variable depends on the other variables in the model. This is a problem, particularly when using a large number of independent variables which are highly correlated.

In terms of the (coefficient) Beta value interpretation, the higher Beta scores increase the log odds of success or Graduation from the ISP program, coded 1. The given strength of the negative Beta values increase the log odds of failure, or Returned to prison, coded 0. Thus we can see that unemployment, living with friends, High School dropout, living alone or with sibling, number of prior probation or parole revocations, number of prior convictions, High School graduation, and living with a parent or sibling, have, in varying degrees, stronger propensities toward failure based upon their coding. Indicators and their strengths for success or Graduation from ISP were some college or vocational education, full time employment, college degree, and living with spouse and child. In terms of race and sex, positive Beta values demonstrate a higher propensity for whites and females toward success (each coded 1, with their respective counterparts coded 0). The reader will note the disproportionate Beta value for the predicted success for the variable SEX at the value 1 (female). This may be due in part to the very low number of females in the program (N=48) and their higher success rate than males (N=421).

However, this model as a whole should be interpreted with caution, as the significance levels for the majority of variables in the

model lie at unacceptable levels. Those variables selected by the SPSS logistic regression model as significant at the .05 level or better were employment status (unemployed) number of prior probation or parole revocations, number of prior convictions, sex, and race.

In order to assess consistency and magnitude of significance of these five variables, they are compared and contrasted to their respective counterparts in the bivariate analysis. Employment status shows extraordinary significance at .00000. The category of interest (unemployed) shows a 63% return to prison rate. This is consistent with the strong negative Beta weight in the multivariate analysis. The number of prior probation or parole revocations also proves to be very significant in the bivariate analysis at .00000 with a strong relationship between higher numbers of revocations (4+ revocations were returned to prison at a 100% rate) - consistent with the negative Beta in the regression table. Likewise, number of times on probation or parole was also significant at the .00000 level with high numbers of probation or parole experiences showing a failure rate of 65 percent, also consistent with the negative Beta score. The dichotomous variable sex, however, did not attain adequate significance in the bivariate analysis at .13314. This again may be explained in part by the disproportionate number of males to females and the inverse relationship between the percentage of females in the ISP program and the higher success rates they attained. Finally, race showed a significant level in the bivariate analysis at .00001 with a success rate at 67 percent for value 1 (white, non-Hispanic).

Thus, with the exception of the variable sex, the independent predictor variables which attained acceptable significance levels in the multivariate predictive model were highly consistent with the straightforward findings shown in the bivariate contingency tables.

Table 12

Classification Table for Graduated/Returned to prison

		Predicted		
Observed		Returned	Graduated	
Returned		115	75	60.53%
Graduated		51	223	81.39%
				Overall 72.84%

Table 12 shows that the logistic regression model with the variables selected by the SPSS contrast function successfully predicted 81.39% of ISP graduates and 60.53 of those returned to prison, for an overall success rate of 72.84%.

Chapter V
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Limitations of Risk Assessment

The assessment of offender risk for supervision in the community must always be made with caution. The development and continued refinement of risk assessment scales must be firmly ground in empirical data and employed as a single tool in a larger milieu of crime seriousness, community resources, and sound judicial discretion. There is an inherent danger in attempting to predict future behavior based upon past behavior and experience. Life itself has such a fluid dynamic, ever-changing and evolving, with an infinite number of minute-to-minute choices and challenges. To confine an offender to his or her past to influence future behavior may be a disservice to that individual and to the community as well.

In a balanced approach to ISP probation, administrators have to deal with the unfortunate reality that some probationers will see change as a burden instead of an opportunity. Risk reduction based upon accurate risk assessment, assumes that each person has the potential to learn, to change, and to become a law-abiding and productive participant in the life of the community. This assumption can be measured only in terms of the progress (or lack thereof) of the individual once sanctions are in place.

Summary

The prison crowding dilemma in the United States has given rise to an array of intermediate sanctions which lie between prison

commitment and traditional probation supervision. Intensive Supervision Probation (ISP) programs have proliferated and lie at the forefront of such intermediate sanctions. Intensive supervision is intended to successfully supervise an offender in the community through greatly heightened surveillance, enforcement of strict curfews, frequent random drug and alcohol testing, coordination of rehabilitative services, and requiring full time employment or education and/or vocational training. ISP probation officers have smaller caseloads, averaging 25 offenders per officer, making possible the enforcement and oversight of such stringent requirements, and ultimately placing greater accountability on the offender for his or her actions in the community.

Clearly, one of the most critical issues in the implementation of ISP or any intermediate sanction which seeks to divert a traditionally prison-bound offender from the institution to the community is the issue of offender selection. The question of who is eligible and who is not eligible and the reasoning behind such determinations very often holds the key to offender success or failure in the community. There have been several assessment devices from the simple to the very complex, which have been devised and revised for purposes of screening offenders for risk of recidivism in the community. Variations of such devices are used by booking agents for bond considerations, probation officers during presentence interviews, judges at sentencing, parole boards at parole release hearings, and probation and parole officers in developing supervision strategies. Many of the risk screening devices have several of the personal and criminal history items in common.

Four such devices were selected from the risk assessment literature for consideration in this thesis. Models utilized by the respective correctional agencies in Wisconsin, Oregon, Colorado, and New Jersey were described and discussed. From these popular models, an eclectic approach was used to incorporate both criminal history and personal and social risk factors to determine a common list of ten risk factors to be used as variables in this study.

Data from New Jersey's Intensive Supervision Program was obtained through the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR). The research problem to be applied to the available data was to determine, through statistical analysis, which of the selected variables were most meaningful in the prediction of offender success or failure in the ISP program. Using both bivariate and multivariate analyses, the variables which were significant at acceptable levels for both methods were employment status, number of prior convictions, number of prior probation or parole revocations, sex, and race. The logistic regression model run through SPSS had an overall correct prediction rate of nearly 73 percent, indicating that ISP offender selection based upon models which assess offender risk may account for much higher predicted outcomes than offender selection based merely upon chance alone.

Conclusions

The development of criminal sanctions which sufficiently punish an offender and deter that offender from future criminal activity, while simultaneously serving to rehabilitate that individual so

that he or she can enjoy a crime-free lifestyle will undoubtedly continue to be a difficult endeavor. Faced with the current trend in prison crowding, pitted against a burgeoning public sentiment to get tough on crime, criminal justice agencies nationwide are challenged to foster and improve alternatives to incarceration which met these lofty demands.

Intensive Supervision programs in Georgia, Massachusetts, Arizona, and several other local programs as well as the New Jersey model have shown favorable results in terms of saving prison space, saving correctional dollars, reducing recidivism rates, compensating victims, and rehabilitating offenders. By carefully screening offender risk and eligibility for ISP programs, the positive aspects of offender rehabilitation and accountability along with public demands associated with community supervision may be more easily realized. Once again, however, this will inevitably present a formidable challenge to criminal justice professionals who wish to attain these most favorable outcomes. By way of research-based planning and development of ISP programs, these sanctions may eventually evolve into effective and accepted means of dealing with a growing felony population.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Selected Variables and Frequencies

APPENDIX A

Selected Variables and Frequencies

A) DEPENDENT VARIABLE

GRADUATED OR RETURNED TO PRISON

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent
Returned to Prison	0	194	41.4
Graduated	1	275	58.6

B) INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

SEX (N=469)

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent
Male	0	421	89.8
Female	1	48	10.2

RACE (N=469)

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent
Non-white	0	198	42.2
White	1	271	57.8

OFFENDER'S LIVING SITUATION IN THE COMMUNITY (N=469)

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent
Friends	0	31	6.6
Parent/ Sibling	1	230	49.0
Alone/Just Sibling	2	58	12.4
Just Spouse/Just Child	3	49	10.4
Spouse/Child	4	101	21.5

EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT SENTENCE (N=469)

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent
Unemployed/Unable	0	139	29.6
Part-Time Job/Student	1	48	10.2
Full-Time Job	2	282	60.1

DRUG DEPENDENCE PROBLEM (N=469)

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent
Yes	0	273	58.2
No	1	196	41.8

ALCOHOL DEPENDENCE PROBLEM (N=469)

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent
Yes	0	148	31.6
No	1	321	68.4

EDUCATION COMPLETED (N=469)

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent
Other	0	5	1.1
HS Dropout	1	241	52.5
HS Grad/GED	2	119	25.4
Some College/HS&VocTech	3	85	18.1
BA/BS/Post Grad degree	4	19	4.1

NUMBER OF PRIOR CONVICTIONS (N=469)

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent
	0	146	31.1
	1	98	20.9
	2	71	15.1
	3	40	8.5
	4	32	6.8
	5	17	3.6
	6	22	4.7
	7	6	1.3
	8	9	1.9
	9	10	2.1
	10+	18	3.8

NUMBER OF TIME ON PROBATION OR PAROLE (N=469)

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent
	0	193	41.2
	1	137	29.2
	2	59	12.6
	3	36	7.7
	4	13	2.7
	5	9	1.9
	6	9	1.9
	7	5	1.1
	8	1	.2
	9	2	.4
	10+	5	1.1

NUMBER OF PROBATION/PAROLE REVOCATIONS (N=469)

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent
	0	383	81.6
	1	58	12.4
	2	16	3.4
	3	6	1.3
	4+	6	1.3

APPENDIX B

Assistance/Disclaimer Statement

APPENDIX B

Assistance/Disclaimer Statement

The Data and tabulations utilized in this thesis were made available by the inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research. The data for INTENSIVE SUPERVISION PROGRAM IN NEW JERSEY, 1983-1986 were originally collected and prepared by Frank Pearson. Neither the collector of the original data nor the Consortium bears any responsibility for the analyses or interpretations presented here.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Austin, Jim, and Krisberg, Barry (1982). The Unmet Promise of Alternatives to Inacrceration. San Fransisco: National Council on Crime and Delinquency: Mimeo.

Baird, S. Christopher (1983). Intensive Supervision in Probation: A Survey of Current Programs. Madison, WI: National Council on Crime and Delinquency.

Burkhart, W.R. (1986). Intensive Supervision Probation: An Agenda for Research and Evaluation. Federal Probation, 50 (2), 75-78.

Byrne, J.M. (1986). The Control Controversy: A Preliminary Examination of Intensive Supervision Programs in The United States. Federal Probation, 50 (2), 4-19.

Castle, Michael N. (1991). Alternative Sentencing: Selling It to the Public. Washington, D.C: National Institute of Justice Research in Action

Clear, T.R., and Shapiro, C. (1986). Identifying High-Risk Probationers for Supervision in the Community: The Oregon Model. Federal Probation 50 (2), 42-49.

Clear, Todd, and O'Leary, Vincent (1984) Controlling the Offender in the Community, Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books. Pp.79.

Cochran, D. (1988). Corrections' Catch-22. Corrections Today, October, 1988, 16-19.

Cochran, D., Corbett, R.P., and Byrne, J.M. (1986). Intensive Supervision Probation in Massachusetts: A Case Study In Change. Federal Probation, 50 (2), 32-41.

Fogg, V. (1988). Effective Alternative: Colorado's Intensive Supervision. Corrections Today, 50 (1), 50-58.

Gettinger, S. (1983). Intensive Supervision: Can It Rehabilitate Probation? Corrections Magazine, April, 1983. Pp. 6-17.

Gottfredson, S. and Gottfredson, D.M. (1984). Screening for Risk. Washington, D.C: National Institute of Corrections.

Gowdy, Voncille (1991). Intermediate Sanctions. Washington D.C: National Institute of Justice Research in Brief.

Kachigan, S.K. (1986). Statistical Analysis. New York: Radius Press.

Kerlinger, F. (1986). Foundations of Behavioral Research, Fort Worth: Holt, Reinhart and Winston, Inc.

Klofas, Stojkovic, and Kalinich (1990). Criminal Justice Organizations: Administration and Management. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing.

Knapp, M. Kostas, H. and Missiakoulis, S. (1982). Investigating labor turnover and wastage using Logit Technique. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 55, 129-138.

Latessa, E.J. (1986). The Cost Effectiveness of Intensive Supervision Probation. Federal Probation, 50 (2), 70-81.

Lindner, C., and Kohler, R. (1992). Probation Officer Victimization: An Emerging Concern. Journal of Criminal Justice, 20, 53-62.

Lipchitz, J.W. (1986). Back to the Future: An Historical View of Intensive Probation Supervision. Federal Probation, 50 (2), 78-81.

Lurigio, A.J. (1987). Perceptions and Attitudes of Judges and Attorneys Toward Intensive Probation Supervision. Federal Probation, 51 (1), 16-24.

Neubauer, D.W. (1988). America's Courts and the Criminal Justice System. Pacific Grove, Ca: Brooks/Cole Publishing.

Michigan's Criminal Justice/Substance Abuse Rountable (1995). Time for a Change: A Strategic Framework (Draft).

Morgan, S. Philip and Teachman, J.D. (1988). Logistic Regression: Description, Examples, and Comparisons. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 50, 929-936.

Nelson, E.K., Ohmart, H., and Harlow, N. (1978). Promising Strategies in Probation and Parole. Washington D.C: National Intitute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice.

Pearson, Frank S. INTENSIVE SUPERVISION PROGRAM IN NEW JERSEY, 1983-1986 (Computer file). New Brunswick, New Jersey: Institute for Criminological Research, 1987. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research, 1990.

-------- (1987). Final Report of Research on New Jersey's Intensive Supervision Program. Rutgers University Institute for Criminological Research.

-------- (1988). Evaluation of New Jersey's Intensive Supervision Probation. Crime and Delinquency, 34 (4), 437-448.

Simon, F. H. (1971). Prediction Methods in Criminology. London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office.

Smith, Wm., Rhine, E., and Jackson, R. (1989). Parole Practices in the United States. Corrections Today, October 1989, Pp. 22-28.

SPSS User's Manual 6.1.1 (1994) Chicago, Ill: SPSS.

Tabackhnick, B.G. & Fidell, L.S. (1989). Using Multivariate Statistics (2nd ed.). New York: Harper Collins.

Walsh, Anthony (1987). Teaching Understanding and Interpretation of Logit Regression. Teaching Sociology, 15, 178-183.

Wentz, C. and Oldroyd, R.J. (1979). Rational Risk Assessment for Probationers. Utah Division of Corrections.

Wisconsin Division of Corrections, Dept. of Health and Social Services. (1986). Project Report #2: Development of the Wisconsin Risk Assessment Scale.

Zhang, X., and DeLaPaz, C. (1990). The Evaluation of the Wisconsin Classification System as it Applies to The Los Angeles Probation Population. National Institute of Corrections.