

**Effects of Supervision
Philosophy on Intensive
Probationers**

Kelly L. Brown*



Volume 4 – No. 1 –Spring 2007

** Kelly Brown is an Assistant Professor of Criminal Justice in the School of Public and Environmental Affairs at Indiana University Kokomo.*

Abstract

Past research on intensive supervision probation (ISP) programs has found that program which include treatment components may more effectively reduce recidivism and that programs which offer a balanced approach to ISP may be most effective. Despite these claims, the existing literature has not examined the impact of supervision philosophy (e.g., a control or treatment orientation) of ISP programs on recidivism. This research examines the effects of supervision philosophy on re-arrest and failure to complete ISP. The findings reveal that supervision philosophy impacts program failure but not the re-arrest of intensive probationers. The results also suggest that other predictors of recidivism may be more important in predicting the recidivism of intensive probationers than supervision philosophy. Implications of these findings are discussed.

About the Author

Kelly Brown is an Assistant Professor of Criminal Justice in the School of Public and environmental affairs at Indiana University in Kokomo, IN. She received her Ph.D. from the University of Cincinnati in 1999. She is an Assistant Professor of Criminal Justice in the School of Public and Environmental Affairs at Indiana University Kokomo. Her research and teaching interests include capital punishment and death row, attitudes toward crime and correctional policy, crime and deviance among college students, and religion and crime. She may be contacted at kelkebro@iuk.edu or at School of Public and Environmental Affairs, Indiana University Kokomo, P.O. Box 9003, Kokomo, Indiana 46904.

Effects of Supervision Philosophy on Intensive Probationers

Introduction

There is no shortage of research on intensive supervision probation (ISP) programs. Since their inception in the late 1950s, these programs have been studied extensively to determine their effectiveness in terms of reduced recidivism, cost savings, and/or prison diversion. Intensive supervision and the research evaluating it have evolved in three waves. The first wave was an experiment that sought to find the “magic number” of cases per probation officer. It was believed that smaller caseloads would lead to increased contacts between offenders and their probation officers and to subsequent reductions in recidivism (Adams, 1967; Adams and Vetter, 1971). Early studies were designed to test the efficacy of smaller caseloads for individual probation officers. These studies found that reducing caseloads and increasing contacts between probation officers and probationers did not reduce the recidivism rates of criminal offenders (Carter and Wilkins, 1976; Clear and Hardyman, 1990).

As the guiding philosophy of the criminal justice system changed from rehabilitation to retribution and deterrence in the 1980s, growing prison populations and financial concerns made it necessary to look for ways to control and punish offenders in the community (Byrne, 1990; Cullen, Wright, and Applegate, 1996). ISPs re-emerged as the vehicle to achieve this goal. This second wave of ISPs promised to control and punish offenders in the community, while at the same time successfully divert prison bound offenders, save states money, and reduce recidivism.

As research on the second generation of ISPs appeared, it became clear that ISPs were not successful in achieving their numerous goals. It was argued that, instead of

diverting offenders from prison, ISPs were widening the net of criminal justice control (Byrne, Lurigio, and Baird, 1989; Tonry, 1990; Turner and Petersilia, 1992; Whitehead, Miller, and Myers, 1995). Offenders, who previously would have received regular supervision, were now being placed on intensive supervision. These offenders, critics contended, were just as likely to have succeeded on regular probation. Consequently, ISPs were not diverting offenders from prison and were costing states more money than if the offender had been placed on regular probation.

Research also revealed that predicted reductions in recidivism rates have not been realized (Byrne and Kelly, 1989; Cullen et al., 1996; Petersilia and Turner, 1991). Some intensive supervision programs could only boast of recidivism rates that are no worse than if the offender had been incarcerated (Smith and Akers, 1993). Much research shows that ISPs are not decreasing recidivism rates in comparison to regular supervision (Latessa and Vito, 1988; Petersilia and Turner, 1992; Turner, Petersilia, and Deschenes, 1992). In fact, some studies have shown that recidivism rates are higher for intensive probationers than offenders on regular probation (e.g., Turner and Petersilia, 1992). This suggests that, at least for some offenders, intensive supervision is more harmful than if they had been placed on regular supervision (Clear and Hardyman, 1990).

Because ISPs have not been the panacea they were promoted as being, ISPs are in danger of being abandoned (Byrne, 1990; Clear, Flynn, and Shapiro, 1987; Stone and Fulton, 1995). Failure to fulfill too many expectations can mean death to programs and policies spouted as the latest solution to the current correctional crisis (Byrne, 1990).

The third generation of ISPs has attempted to thwart the “death” of ISPs by focusing on offering a balanced approach to supervision. Research has suggested that

programs that combine treatment and control components may be more effective than treatment or control alone in bringing about reduced recidivism (Byrne, 1990; Byrne and Kelly, 1989; Fulton, Stone, and Gendreau, 1994; Harland and Rosen, 1987). It is argued that it may be possible to use deterrent measures to control offender behavior and to encourage participation in treatment programs. Programs that emphasize the balanced approach may be able to control short-term behavior while bringing about long-term behavioral change. Some studies have supported the use of deterrent measures to achieve offender compliance with the treatment components of the ISPs (Byrne and Kelly, 1989; Petersilia et al., 1992). ISPs that are based on this view are beginning to appear. This group of ISPs makes up the third wave of intensive supervision.

While the existing literature has been successful in illuminating the issues regarding this alternative sentence, there are still many unanswered questions. Past research has compared intensive supervision to both prison and regular probation in terms of prison diversion, cost savings, recidivism reduction, and provision of an intermediate sanction (e.g., Clear and Hardyman, 1990; Haas and Latessa, 1995; Petersilia and Turner, 1992; Smith and Akers, 1993). Based on this research, we know that many intensive supervision probation programs are not achieving cost savings, prison diversion, or reduced recidivism as compared to regular supervision programs and incarceration. More recent investigations of ISP have examined the effects of ISP on particular groups and the effects of combining ISP with other programs. For example, Warchol (2000) examined the effectiveness of ISP on high-risk DWI offenders and found that DWI offenders who completed ISP were less likely to recidivate than offenders who were incarcerated. Johnson (2001) found similar results for domestic violence offenders placed on ISP.

Marciniak (2000) examined the impact of combining day reporting with intensive supervision probation. She found no significant differences in the recidivism of offenders who were sentenced to ISP and day reporting and those sentenced to ISP alone. What remains unclear is how intensive supervision probation programs compare with one another and the impact of different supervision philosophies (e.g., treatment or control) of programs on offender behavior.

Little is actually known about the effects of programs which emphasize treatment, control, or the balanced approach on recidivism. It is possible that a program which emphasizes one correctional philosophy is better at achieving a particular goal than a program that emphasizes a different philosophy. For instance, a program which emphasizes treatment may be more likely to reduce recidivism than a program based on punishment. Likewise, a program which implements a balanced approach may be more successful in reducing system costs.

Further, it is not known how the impact of supervision philosophy might compare to known predictors of recidivism. Past research has identified a wide array of factors (such as age, race, gender, prior record, and employment) that are consistently related to recidivism (see, for example, Gendreau, Little, and Goggin, 1996; Jones, 1995; Petersilia and Turner, 1990, 1992; Ryan, 1997). It is important to assess the impact of supervision philosophy in light of the effects of other known predictors of recidivism. It is possible that supervision philosophy may have a greater impact on recidivism than these known predictors of crime. For example, a program which has a treatment rather than control approach to supervision may impact recidivism regardless of the age, race, gender, and employment status of offenders. Conversely, supervision philosophy may not have as

much influence on recidivism as other factors. Understanding how supervision philosophy influences recidivism compared to that of these known predictors will lead to a better understanding of effective correctional programming.

This research is a first step in exploring the effects of varying correctional philosophies in intensive supervision on individual offender recidivism. Specifically, this research attempts to answer the following research question. *Compared to other predictors of recidivism, how is the recidivism of individual offenders affected by the correctional philosophy of an intensive supervision program?*

Methods

This research was conducted in Ohio. Ohio has a Community Corrections Act (CCA) which funds intensive supervision probation programs in twenty-five counties. The CCA was created in 1979 and allocated funds to counties to develop community corrections programs in an attempt to alleviate prison overcrowding.

The intensive supervision programs in Ohio have a variety of goals which make them ideal for this study. These programs have varying philosophies which allow the programs to be measured based on the programs' emphasis on control and treatment. This is not possible in some states in which all intensive supervision programs are operated by the state rather than individual counties or in those states in which the ISPs operate on the same philosophy. Second, the State of Ohio funded an extensive research project which included an evaluation of the ISPs in the twenty-five counties. This project involved the collection of data on 1855 offenders sentenced to intensive supervision in Ohio during fiscal years 1991 - 1993. This data set is one source of data in this study.

Felony offenders who were sentenced to intensive supervision probation during fiscal years 1991 to 1993 were eligible for the study. The State of Ohio's PROBER database was used as the sampling frame. The PROBER database contains a list of all offenders placed on ISP in each of the counties during fiscal years 1991 to 1993. Because of the differences in county size, there was variation in the number of offenders each county sentenced to intensive supervision probation. Consequently, cases were selected using the proportionate stratified sampling technique so that the proportion of cases from each county in the sample resembled the proportion of cases from each county in the population. If information was not available on a case, the case was replaced. Follow-up information on offenders in the sample was collected through the end of fiscal year 1996.

The second source of data is primary data designed to measure the supervision philosophy of the various programs. Data were collected from ISP supervisors in twenty-five intensive supervision probation programs in 1998. These counties were selected because they were funded by the Ohio CCA and were included in the secondary data set. A list of 32 ISP supervisors in the twenty-five counties was compiled through telephone contacts with the chief probation officer or the CCA program director in each county.

The ISP supervisor, rather than the chief probation officer or CCA project director, was selected as the respondent for this questionnaire because the ISP supervisor might have more knowledge regarding what approach a particular program is actually using. Research indicates that upper and middle management and line staff may have different views on what an organization is trying to accomplish (O'Leary and Duffee, 1971b). O'Leary and Duffee (1971a) also found that line staff were more likely to pick

up cues on what behaviors they should emulate and what policies they should follow from their supervisors rather than policy directives or upper management preferences. Thus, it was determined that ISP supervisors would be the most appropriate respondent.

Four counties had more than one ISP supervisor, thus a total of 32 ISP supervisors were identified. Following Dillman's (1978) total design method with slight modifications, questionnaires were sent to the 32 ISP supervisors. Twenty-nine (90.6%) completed usable questionnaires were returned. In those counties with more than one respondent, the scores on each scale were averaged so that each county had only one score for each measure of supervision philosophy.

Supervisor Characteristics

Most of the respondents were male (62.1%) and had earned a bachelor's degree (45%) or a master's degree (41%). The average age of respondents was 44 years. The youngest supervisor was 30 years old. The oldest was 61 years of age.

The average length of time the supervisors had worked as probation officers was 14 years. One respondent had worked as a probation officer for as few as four months, another had worked as a probation officer for over 27 years. Over one half the supervisors had worked in their county's probation department for more than ten years. However, only five supervisors (19% of the respondents) had worked in their ISP unit over ten years. Over 80 percent of the respondents had been the supervisor of the ISP unit in their county for two or more years.

Approximately 76 percent of the respondents had worked in either another corrections or criminal justice system position. Six of these had worked in corrections or another part of the criminal justice field for over ten years. The supervisors had worked

in a variety of positions including positions in regular probation, juvenile probation, alcohol and drug counseling, community based correctional facilities, jail reduction programs, correctional institutions, law enforcement, work release programs, and court compliance programs.

The number of ISP officers in each county ranged from two to twenty-two. The average caseload of ISP officers in the counties was 43 offenders; however, the caseloads of ISP officers ranged from 10 to 75 offenders per ISP officer.

Offender Characteristics

Supervision philosophy data could not be collected in one county; thus, the offenders from this county were eliminated from the data set. This study investigates the recidivism of 1,790 offenders from 24 counties. As indicated in Table 1, the majority of offenders were male (78%). The mean age of the offenders was 29 years. Approximately 60 percent of the offenders were white; 35 percent were black. Furthermore, the majority of the offenders (54%) were single and had between ten and twelve years of education (66%).

The offenders in the sample had fairly extensive criminal histories, with approximately 83% of the offenders having had two or more arrests. However, just over 50% did not have any prior felony convictions. In short, while the sample appears to be engaging in high levels of criminal activity, the activity engaged in by the offenders does not appear to be overly serious or violent. This is further supported by the fact that for almost half (44%) of the offenders, the current ISP sentence was the first probation sentence.

Independent Variable

The independent variable is supervision philosophy. The nature of intensive supervision suggests that probation departments must include both treatment and control components. Examination of the programs included in this study revealed that the programs include both treatment and control components and that the programs consider both treatment and control important program objectives. For example, an examination of program components revealed that all the programs included some form of control mechanisms (e.g., required contacts with probation officer, drug tests, and restitution) and offered treatment services (e.g., drug treatment, education, counseling, mental health treatment).

Further, a request for each program's mission statements, goals and objectives, and most recent grant application was made. All counties responded with this information. An examination (not shown here) of the mission statements and objectives revealed that all intensive supervision programs included in the study consider both treatment and control objectives of their programs. Therefore, any attempt to place the 24 programs in mutually exclusive categories of treatment, control, and balanced approaches would be futile. In fact, attempts to categorize programs based on the nature of their components were not successful since all programs included components of treatment and control. It appears, then, that the balanced approach of the third wave of ISPs is well established.

Despite the fact that the programs include both treatment and control elements, the programs are likely to have different orientations or emphasis in the approach to supervision. The components of the programs and the stated goals or missions of the

program are driven by various factors including, but not limited to, the interests of the many stakeholders and the pragmatic needs of the program. However, past research indicates that intensive supervision probation programs do vary in the degree to which they embrace treatment and control philosophies (e.g., Clear and Latessa, 1993) and that programs that include control or punishment alone are not effectively reducing recidivism (Byrne, 1990; Cullen, Wright, and Applegate, 1996). Thus, this research attempts to measure the degree to which a program embraces either philosophy.

Supervision philosophy is measured on a 10-point scale. The intensive supervision probation supervisor was asked to rank on a scale of one to ten which statement best described the main mission of intensive supervision in his or her county. The control philosophy description, placed at the high end of the scale, was as follows: “The punishment and control of offenders in the community through close monitoring and supervision.” A treatment philosophy, placed at the low end of the scale, was distinguished from a control philosophy by the following definition: “the change of offender behavior through the provision of services and treatment.” Thus, the scale measures the extent to which a particular county embraces either a control or treatment orientation. A program that emphasizes control more than treatment falls on the high end of the scale. The treatment-oriented program has a low score. The mission scores ranged from one to eight. The mean score was 5.15. The standard deviation was 1.87.

Known predictors of recidivism were included in the analysis to assess how well the factors predict recidivism in intensive supervision probationers and to determine how important, in comparison to other predictors of recidivism, supervision philosophy is in reducing recidivism among individual offenders.

The use of these known predictors of recidivism controls for potential population differences that may affect recidivism. For example, age, race, gender, and the number of drug tests may influence outcomes distinct from the effects of the programs' supervision philosophy. Therefore, it is important that these factors be controlled in the analyses so that the specific effects of the supervision philosophy can be assessed. Individual characteristics (e.g., demographic characteristics, criminal history, seriousness of current offense), program characteristics (e.g., number of community service hours worked, number of drug tests, and number of positive drug tests), agency characteristics (i.e., average caseload for ISP officers), and one county characteristic (i.e., county population) were included in the study. Criminal history was measured as the mean score on a scale (0 to 6) that included prior felony convictions (0 = none, 1 = 1 or more), prior adult felony commitments (0 = none, 1 = 1 or more), prior conviction for same offense (0 = none, 1 = 1 or more), times sentenced to probation (0 = 1, 1 = 2 or more), number of arrests (0 = 1, 1 = 2 or more), and number of adult convictions (0 = 1, 1 = 2 or more). The Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the criminal history scale was .76. Seriousness of current offense was measured as the degree of the felony committed by the offender which led to his or her placement on intensive supervision probation. The seriousness of the current offense was coded so that more serious offenses were higher numbers (e.g., D felony = 1, A felony = 4).

Dependent Variables

Two dependent variables were examined in this study: recidivism and failure to complete the ISP program. Recidivism was measured as any arrest for criminal behavior (excluding traffic offenses) after an offender was placed on ISP until the end of the

follow-up period. The follow-up period ranged from 3 to 6 years depending on when the offender was initially placed on ISP. The average follow-up period was four and one-half years. As indicated in Table 1, approximately 47% of the offenders in the study were re-arrested.

Offenders failed to complete the ISP program if their probation was revoked due to a technical violation, they were incarcerated for new offenses, they absconded, or they were transferred to a new unit (e.g., a community based residential program) due to a technical violation. Offenders successfully completed intensive supervision if they were released from any supervision or transferred to regular supervision after fulfilling all the ISP conditions. Approximately 56% of the offenders successfully completed ISP, while 44% failed to complete the program. It is possible that a new arrest could lead to an offender failing to complete the program, thus, creating an overlap in the dependent variables. Bi-variate analysis showed that while the two dependent variables are correlated ($r = .403$), the relationship is not strong enough to indicate multicollinearity. Therefore, it was determined that the two dependent variables are measuring two different factors in the lives of offenders on intensive supervision.

Results

The results of the analyses are mixed. Bi-variate analyses revealed that supervision philosophy was significantly related to re-arrest, but not significantly related to failure to complete program. These relationships did not hold in the logistic regression analyses. The logistic regression analyses revealed that supervision philosophy is significantly related to program failure; however,

supervision philosophy is not significantly correlated with arrest when other variables are included in the analysis.

Table 2 shows the results of the logistic regression model where failure to complete the program is the dependent variable. Supervision philosophy is significantly related to program failure at the .05 level. Offenders from programs that emphasize treatment are more likely to fail than offenders from programs that emphasize control. Many of the control variables are significantly related to failure to complete the program. Offenders from counties with larger populations are more likely to fail to complete the ISP program. Additionally, offenders who are young, offenders who are male, offenders who have more serious criminal histories, and offenders who were unemployed at follow-up were more likely to fail. Not surprisingly, offenders who had tested positive for drugs during the program were also more likely to fail. The amount of court costs and fines paid and the amount of community service hours completed were also related to offender failure. Offenders were more likely to fail to complete the ISP program if they had paid lesser amounts of court costs and completed fewer community service hours. Offenders who committed less serious offenses were also more likely to fail.

Similar results were found when the analysis included arrest as the dependent variable rather than program failure (see Table 3). That is, offenders from more highly populated counties, offenders with more serious criminal histories, younger offenders, and male offenders are more likely to be arrested after release to ISP. Similarly, unemployed offenders and those who completed fewer community service hours were more likely to be arrested. Finally, offenders who committed less serious offenses were more likely to be arrested.

Discussion

The results reveal that supervision philosophy is related to failure to complete the program. That is, offenders from programs that emphasize a treatment-oriented approach to supervision are more likely to fail. This finding is somewhat surprising in light of past research which indicates that offenders in programs that include treatment components are more likely to succeed (e.g., Andrews, Zinger, Hoge, Bonta, Gendreau, and Cullen, 1990; Byrne, 1990; Gendreau et al., 1994; Pearson, 1987; Petersilia and Turner, 1992).

The finding that offenders from treatment-oriented programs are more likely to fail than offenders from control-oriented programs could be explained in different ways. First, a program's emphasis on control could act as a deterrent to offenders. Offenders in programs that emphasize control may work to abide by the program's conditions to avoid penalties for noncompliance. Further, offenders who are aware their actions are being monitored may take more care and have fewer lapses into criminal behavior or technical violations. Extant research generally does not support these explanations. Research on deterrence has shown that internal and informal, rather than formal, sanctions are more effective in reducing, or preventing, crime (e.g., Blackwell, 2000; Paternoster and Simpson, 1996). Further, prior ISP research has revealed that offenders who are watched more closely are more likely to get caught and, consequently, fail (Petersilia and Turner, 1992).

Another more likely explanation for the findings is that a program, which emphasizes control over offender behavior, is also ensuring compliance with treatment

and control components of the program. Compliance with treatment and control components leads to successful completion of the program. Fulton et al. (1994; see also, Byrne and Kelly, 1989; Petersilia et al., 1992) suggest that it is possible to use control elements of programs to restrict offender behavior and to encourage participation in treatment programs. That is, ISPs may be able to control short-term behavior while bringing about long-term behavioral change. Programs that do not emphasize control, but rather place an emphasis on treatment, may not have the means available to ensure offender participation in treatment programs despite a treatment orientation.

The finding that supervision philosophy is not significantly related to the re-arrest of offenders is reasonable. The re-arrest variable may be measuring the behavior of actors in the criminal justice system (e.g., police officers) rather than the behavior of offenders. Arrests may be due to an array of factors including, but not limited to, police officer discretion, departmental policy, and resources of police departments that are unrelated to the philosophy that drives an intensive probation program. Thus, the supervision philosophy of a particular program (in this case an ISP program) would not be expected to affect the behavior of practitioners in other criminal justice agencies (e.g., police officers who make arrests). Piquero's (2003) investigation of a specialized ISP where police officers were directly involved in the ISP program lends support to this contention. She found that arrests, not technical violations, were more likely when police officers were directly involved in the intensive supervision of probationers.

The findings reveal that supervision philosophy is just one of several program characteristics that are related to program failure, but not to arrest. Program characteristics including, fewer community service hours completed and fewer costs paid

were not significantly related to re-arrest. Notably, this is also true for positive drug tests. Offenders who tested positive for drugs were more likely to fail the program, but were no more likely to be re-arrested than offenders who did not test positive for drugs or who tested positive for drugs less frequently. Supervision philosophy is a program characteristic. Program characteristics would not necessarily affect the arresting behavior of police officers. This is seen in the amount of explained variance (as indicated by the pseudo- R^2) in the dependent variables in the overall models. Table 3 shows that the model explains almost 32% of the variation in failure to complete the program while Table 4 shows that the model explains just 21% of the variation in re-arrest.

There is yet another possible explanation for why supervision philosophy is related to program failure but not to re-arrest. Programs that emphasize control and ensure successful program completion may not have an effect on re-arrest unless the program's treatment components address criminogenic needs. If ISP programs that are control-oriented programs do not address criminogenic needs, it is likely that the programs will not reduce recidivism (see, for example, Gendreau et al., 1996) and will have an adverse effect on the lives of offenders (e.g., Clear and Hardyman, 1990). At best, these programs may have no effect on criminal behavior and, at worst, may increase the criminal behavior of the offenders who pass through their doors. In short, the impact of supervision philosophy on offender behavior may only be through its ability to ensure offender compliance with the conditions of the program. If the conditions of the program do not include an effective treatment component, the program may have no lasting effect on the offenders' lives or criminal activity. Alternately, if a program's supervision philosophy emphasizes treatment, the current research has shown that, not only is the

program not likely to affect re-arrest, but it will have little or no effect on program completion. This may be the case regardless of whether or not a program's components address criminogenic needs. Programs that emphasize control have a realistic means of ensuring offender compliance. If the offender is required to abide by conditions that address criminogenic needs and the program's control-orientation can ensure compliance with those conditions, it seems likely that the program will reduce recidivism. The data in this study were not sufficient to investigate whether or not the programs included treatment components that specifically addressed criminogenic needs.

Many of the known predictors of recidivism included in the current analyses were found to be significantly related to failure to complete the program and re-arrest. Age and unemployment are the only variables significantly related to both program failure and re-arrest at the .000 level. These findings support numerous research studies that have documented the relationship between age and crime and the relationship between unemployment and crime. Younger people are more likely to commit crime than older people (e.g., Gendreau et al., 1996; Ryan, 1997) and individuals who are unemployed are more likely to commit crime than employed individuals (e.g., Byrne and Kelly 1989; Jolin and Stipak 1992; Jones 1995; Petersilia and Turner 1990, 1992; Ryan 1997).

Policy Implications

The findings indicate that supervision philosophy, when other variables are held constant, can influence the completion of intensive supervision probation. Offenders in control-oriented programs are more likely to complete the program. However, it is not enough to simply complete the program. Ideally, ISPs need to be designed not only to improve the lives of offenders (e.g., higher education, gainful employment), but to reduce

recidivism as well. If ISP is to remain a viable means of reducing recidivism, programs that emphasize control must also incorporate program elements that address criminogenic needs and work to improve the lives of offenders. ISPs that effectively reduce recidivism can in turn reduce costs and save resources.

The findings also suggest that employment may be a key to program effectiveness. Employed offenders are less likely to be re-arrested and more likely to successfully complete ISP. Future research is needed in this area and practitioners should carefully consider how employment of offenders can factor into their programs. Finally, particular attention should be paid to the youthful offender. Youthful offenders are more likely to fail and to be re-arrested. Thus, programs should implement policy designed to address the particular needs of the young offender.

Limitations

Despite the importance of these findings to intensive supervision probation, this research is not without limitations. One possible limitation to the study is the time lag in data sets. The data regarding supervision philosophy was collected after offenders were released from supervision. This could affect the results of the study and, consequently, the results should be viewed with some caution. However, despite the time lag, it is believed that the study does shed some light on this issue and that the effect of the time gap is minor. Probation departments do not change rapidly. Further, the manner in which departments typically change operating philosophy is slow and often “noisy.” This may be particularly true for departments at which practitioners have been employed for long periods of time. More than half of the ISP supervisors who responded to the survey had worked in their probation department more than ten years. Over 80% of the

supervisors had been the ISP unit supervisors for two or more years. It seems reasonable to expect that any changes in these departments would take some time and that the time frame of the data collection in this study is not overly problematic.

Another limitation is the lack of data on the content of program components. Examinations of program components, missions, and goals revealed that each of the programs included in the study had both treatment and control elements. However, it was not possible to determine what the treatment components entailed. Future research should examine supervision philosophy in conjunction with the actual content of ISP services and components. Still, the evidence presented here suggests that programs that do not emphasize control cannot ensure compliance with the conditions of ISP regardless of what those conditions might be. The evidence further suggests that other factors such as employment may have a strong impact on recidivism and future research should investigate how ISPs might address these needs.

Conclusion

The supervision philosophy of intensive supervision probation programs appears to have some effect on program completion. Notably, programs that have a control-oriented focus are more likely than those with a treatment orientation to produce successful program completion. The effects of supervision philosophy on re-arrest are not as apparent. Supervision philosophy was not significantly related to arrest. Known predictors of recidivism were related to both program failure and re-arrest.

Future research endeavors might investigate why offenders in control-oriented programs are more likely to complete the program and how this affects future criminal behavior. Is there a deterrent effect or does an emphasis on control lead to compliance

with effective treatment components? Future investigations should also examine whether or not programs are addressing criminogenic needs and the effect control elements of ISP have on the process.

This research was a first step in exploring these issues. The results indicate that supervision philosophy does play a role in offenders' success and failure to complete intensive supervision. Definitive conclusions about the importance of supervision philosophy, its role in offender recidivism, and its importance to program operations must wait for future explorations into this important area of community-based corrections.

References

- Adams, S. (1967). "Some findings from correctional caseload research." *Federal Probation* 31, 48-57.
- Adams, R. and Vetter, H. J. (1971). "Probation caseload size and recidivism rate." *British Journal of Criminology* 11(4), 390-393.
- Andrews, D. A., Zinger, I., Hoge, R., Bonta, J., Gendreau, P., and F. T. Cullen. (1990). "Does correctional treatment work? A clinically relevant and psychologically informed meta-analysis." *Criminology* 28(3), 369-404.
- Blackwell, B. S. (2000). "Perceived sanction threats, gender, and crime: A test and elaboration of power-control theory." *Criminology* 38(2), 439-488.
- Byrne, J. M. (1990). "The future of intensive probation supervision and the new intermediate sanctions." *Crime and Delinquency* 36, 6-41.
- Byrne, J. M. and L. M. Kelly. (1989). *Restructuring Probation as an Intermediate Sanction: An Evaluation of the Implementation and Impact of the Massachusetts Intensive Probation Supervision Program*. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice.
- Carter, R. and L. Wilkins. (1976). "Caseloads: Some conceptual models." In R. Carter and L. Wilkins (Eds.), *Probation, Parole, and Community Corrections* (pp. 391-401). New York: Wiley and Sons.
- Clear, T. R. and P. L. Hardyman. (1990). "The new intensive supervision movement." *Crime and Delinquency* 36(1), 42-60.
- Clear, T. R. and E. J. Latessa. (1993). "Probation officers' roles in intensive supervision: Surveillance versus treatment." *Justice Quarterly* 10, 441-462.
- Clear, T. R., Flynn, S., and C. Shapiro. (1987). "Intensive supervision in probation: A comparison of three projects." In B. McCarthy (Ed.), *Intermediate Punishments: Intensive Supervision, Home Confinement and Electronic Surveillance* (pp. 31-50). Monsey, N.Y.: Criminal Justice Press.
- Cullen, F. T., Wright, J. P., and B. K. Applegate. (1996). "Control in the community: The limits of reform?" In A. T. Harland (Ed.), *Choosing Correctional Options That Work: Defining the Demand and Evaluating the Supply* (pp. 69-116). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Dillman, D. A. (1978). *Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total Design Method*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

- Erwin, B. S. (1986). "Turning up the heat on probationers in Georgia." *Federal Probation* 50(2), 17-24.
- Fulton, B. A., Stone, S. B., and P. Gendreau. (1994). *Restructuring Intensive Supervision Programs: Applying "What Works."* Lexington, KY: American Probation and Parole Association.
- Gendreau, P., Cullen, F. T., and J. Bonta. (1994). "Intensive rehabilitation supervision: The next generation in community corrections?" *Federal Probation* 58, 72-78.
- Gendreau, P., Little, T., and C. Goggin. (1996). "A meta-analysis of the predictors of adult offender recidivism: What works!" *Criminology* 34, 575-607.
- Harland, A. T. and C. J. Rosen. (1987). "Sentencing theory and intensive supervision probation." *Federal Probation* 51(4), 33-42.
- Johnson, R. R. (2001). "Intensive probation for domestic violence offenders." *Federal Probation* 63(3), 36-39.
- Jolin, A. and B. Stipak. (1992). "Drug treatment and electronically monitored home confinement: An evaluation of a community based sentencing option." *Crime and Delinquency* 38, 158-70.
- Jones, M. (1995). "Predictors of success and failure on intensive probation supervision." *American Journal of Criminal Justice* 19, 239-254.
- Latessa, E. J. and G. F. Vito. (1988). "The effects of intensive supervision on shock probationers." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 16, 319-330.
- Lawrence, R. (1991). "Reexamining community corrections models." *Crime and Delinquency* 37, 449-464.
- Marciniak, L. M. (2000). "The addition of day reporting to intensive supervision probation: A comparison of recidivism rates." *Federal Probation* 64(1), 34-40.
- Paternoster, R., Saltzman, L. E., Waldo, G. P., and T. G. Chiricos. (1983). "Perceived risk and social control: Do sanctions really deter?" *Law and Society Review* 17, 457-480.
- Pearson, F. S. (1987). *Research on New Jersey's Intensive Supervision Program: A Final Report to the National Institute of Justice.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey.
- Petersilia, J. and S. Turner. (1990). *Intensive Supervision for High Risk Probationers: Findings from Three California Experiments.* Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation.

- Petersilia, J. and S. Turner. (1992). "An evaluation of intensive probation in California." *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 82, 610-658.
- Petersilia, J. and S. Turner. (1993). "Intensive probation and parole." In M. Tonry (Ed.), *Crime and Justice: An Annual Review of the Research* (pp. 281-335). Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Petersilia, J., Turner, S., and E. P. Deschenes. (1992). "The costs and effects of intensive supervision for drug offenders." *Federal Probation* 56, 12-17.
- Piquero, N. L. (2003). "Recidivism analysis of Maryland's community probation program." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 31, 295-307.
- Ryan, J. E. (1997). "Who gets revoked? A comparison of intensive supervision successes and failures in Vermont." *Crime and Delinquency* 43, 104-118.
- Smith, L. G. and R. L. Akers. (1993). "A comparison of recidivism of Florida's community control and prison: A five-year survival analysis." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 30, 267-292.
- Stone, S. B. and B. A. Fulton. (1995). "Achieving public safety through rehabilitation and reintegration: The promise of a new ISP." In J. O. Smykla and W. L. Selke (Eds.), *Intermediate Sanctions: Sentencing in the 1990s* (pp. 115-134). Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing.
- Tonry, M. (1990). "Stated and latent functions of ISP." *Crime and Delinquency* 36, 174-191.
- Turner, S. and J. Petersilia. (1992). "Focusing on high-risk parolees: An experiment to reduce commitments to the Texas department of corrections." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 29, 34-61.
- Turner, S., Petersilia, J., and E. P. Deschenes. (1992). "Evaluating intensive supervision probation/parole (ISP) for drug offenders." *Crime and Delinquency* 38, 539-556.
- Warchol, G. L. (2000). "Intensive supervision probation: An impact evaluation." *The Justice Professional* 13, 219-232.
- Whitehead, J. T., Miller, L. S., and L. B. Myers. (1995). "The diversionary effectiveness of intensive supervision and community corrections programs." In J. O. Smykla and W. L. Selke (Eds.), *Intermediate Sanctions: Sentencing in the 1990s* (pp. 135-212). Cincinnati: Anderson.

Table 1. Offender Demographic Characteristics

	(N)	Percent
<hr/>		
Age		
18 through 21	411	23.0
22 through 28	510	28.5
29 through 35	417	23.3
36 and over	332	18.5
Gender		
male	1401	78.3
female	319	17.8
Race		
American Indian	6	.3
Black	622	34.7
Hispanic	24	1.3
Oriental	3	.2
White	1060	59.2
Other	5	.3
Marital Status		
single/divorced/widowed	1309	73.1
married/common law	379	21.2

Table 1 (continued). Offender Demographic Characteristics

	(N)	Percent
<hr/>		
Employment Status at Termination		
employed	947	52.9
unemployed	711	39.7
Current Offense (Degree of Felony)		
Felony 4	922	51.5
Felony 3	491	27.4
Felony 2	166	9.3
Felony 1	80	4.5
Program Completion		
success	909	55.7
failure	722	44.3
Re-arrest		
no	929	53.4
yes	811	46.6

Table 2. Failure to Complete Program

Variable	B	S.E.	Wald	Significance Level
Age	-.044	.012	14.762	.000***
Female	-.779	.233	11.162	.001**
Married	-.370	.220	2.827	.093
Non-White	.273	.202	1.826	.177
Unemployed	1.498	.179	70.333	.000***
Criminal History	.923	.304	9.223	.002**
Current Offense	-.218	.107	4.131	.042*
Supervision Philosophy	-.116	.054	4.637	.031*
Community Service Hours	-.009	.003	7.268	.007**
Court Costs and Fines	-.002	.000	22.187	.000***
Drug Tests	-.005	.006	.596	.440
Positive Drug Tests	.125	.036	12.041	.001***
County Population	.000	.000	10.027	.002**
Average Caseload	.008	.009	.672	.412

Table 2 (continued). Failure to Complete Program

N = 840 Chi-Square = 321.430 Significance = .000

Pseudo R Square = .318

*P ≤ .05 **P ≤ .01 ***P ≤ .001

Table 3. Re-arrest

Variable	B	S.E.	Wald	Significance Level
Age	-.042	.010	16.490	.000***
Female	-.696	.227	9.398	.002**
Married	.097	.198	.240	.624
Non-White	.331	.181	3.359	.067
Unemployed	.825	.163	25.627	.000***
Criminal History	.869	.280	9.625	.002**
Current Offense	-.232	.099	5.521	.019*
Supervision Philosophy	-.060	.047	1.608	.205
Community Service Hours	-.004	.002	2.857	.091
Court Costs and Fines	.000	.000	1.768	.184
Drug Tests	-.010	.006	2.653	.103
Positive Drug Tests	.046	.030	2.379	.123
County Population	.000	.000	43.167	.000***

Table 3. (continued) Re-arrest

Variable	B	S.E.	Wald	Significance Level
Average Caseload	-.006	.009	.475	.491

N = 879 Chi-Square = 211.954 Significance = .000

Pseudo R Square = .214

*P ≤ .05 **P ≤ .01 ***P ≤ .001