APPENDIX 3: RESEARCH FINDINGS MATRIX

The research in this matrix is a snapshot, rather than a thorough review, of all current research on reducing pretrial misbehavior and offender recidivism. The summaries provided here are intended to briefly describe the major conclusions of the research studies. Each of the studies cited has been reviewed by an expert researcher in the criminal justice system for methodological soundness and interpretation of the findings. Many of the studies focus on general populations and may not be generalizable to special populations, such as women offenders, sex offenders, and so on. Readers are encouraged to refer to the source documents for more in-depth detail about the study methodology, how concepts were measured, the study population, and other contextual information that help put the findings into perspective. In addition, certain areas of the criminal justice system have been studied more rigorously than others and as a result there are gaps in the research that will be evident to the reader. For example, there is very little research on police decisions to arrest or issue citations. Also, some of the studies presented here are very recent; others are not because there are no current research studies that have produced better or different results. Finally, new research is published routinely, and readers should be mindful that new studies may have relevant findings that are not included in this matrix.

HOW TO READ THE MATRIX

The research studies have been categorized into one of four categories: What Doesn’t Work, What Works, What’s Promising, and What’s Not Clear.

- The “What Doesn’t Work” category includes findings based on rigorous and methodologically sound research that repeatedly shows (either through numerous single studies or meta-analysis studies) that the intervention does not have the intended or desired results.
- The “What Works” category is based on rigorous and methodologically sound research that demonstrates significant positive findings (either through numerous single studies or meta-analysis studies).
- The “What’s Promising” category includes findings that show promise but require more rigorous empirical study.
- The final category, “What’s Not Clear,” includes studies that have conflicting findings (i.e., one study shows something works while another study shows that it doesn’t). These findings require additional empirical study.

The first column contains a brief summary of the methodology and major findings that are relevant for evidence-based decision making in the criminal justice system. The second column notes methodological considerations that may impact the generalizability of the findings. The third column highlights the various decision points within the criminal justice system for which the findings are relevant and a summary of possible policy and practice implications.

58 The authors wish to acknowledge the significant contributions of the following researchers, whose reviews appear in whole or in part in this matrix: Melissa Alexander, Timothy Bynum, Ed Latessa, Chris Lowenkamp, Roger Pryzybylski, and Ralph Serin.
### MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS

Rigorous and methodologically sound research and meta-analyses that demonstrate null or negative outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS</th>
<th>IMPLICATIONS &amp; RELEVANT DECISION POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A review of seven meta-analyses investigating the risk principle (defined as the probability of reoffending) found that providing intense correctional interventions to low risk offenders does not decrease recidivism and may even increase recidivism rates. The reasons cited for failure included exposure of low risk offenders to high risk offenders (i.e., antisocial peers) and disruption of the factors that make them low risk (i.e., strong family ties, job, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Primary Citation:* Lowenkamp & Latessa (2004)

| A meta-analysis of 29 studies found that there is no overall effect of boot camps on recidivism (i.e., there were nearly equal odds of recidivating between the boot camp and comparison groups). Juvenile boot camps were less effective overall than adult boot camps. |

*Primary Citation:* MacKenzie, Wilson, & Kider (2001)

*Supporting Citation:* Wilson, MacKenzie, & Mitchell (2005)

| The study included 29 experimental and quasi-experimental studies and used official data and multiple indices of recidivism. There was considerable variation among the studies. In nine studies, boot camp participants had lower recidivism rates than did comparison groups; in eight studies, comparison groups had lower recidivism rates; and in the remaining studies, no significant differences were found. Of the 29 eligible studies, only 9 were published in peer-reviewed journals and the year of publication was not considered. Also, there was insufficient information on sample demographics (gender, ethnicity) for comparisons, some adult boot camps included juveniles, and programming information was incomplete. |

| Implications: The majority of services and more intensive supervision should be directed to higher risk offenders. |

- Diversion decisions
- Plea negotiations
- Sentencing recommendations
- Sentencing decisions
- Community supervision strategy

| Boot camps (especially juvenile boot camps) are of doubtful efficacy. |

- Community intervention strategy

---
### What Doesn’t Work In Reducing Pretrial Misbehavior And Offender Recidivism

#### Major Research Findings

A meta-analysis of 117 studies involving 442,471 offenders showed that none of the three “treatment” conditions—length of time incarcerated, serving an institutional sentence versus receiving a community-based sanction, and receiving an intermediate sanction—were associated with a reduction in recidivism. In fact, longer time periods in prison were associated with an increase in recidivism, compared to shorter time periods in prison. These effects held across gender, adults/juveniles, race, and risk level of the offender. There was some evidence that more stringent sanctions may affect females more adversely than males.

**Primary Citation:** Smith, Goggin, & Gendreau (2002)

**Supporting Citations:** Gendreau, Goggin, & Cullen (1999); Lipsey & Cullen (2007)

#### Methodological Considerations

To be included in the meta-analysis, the study must have used a follow-up period of at least six months and must have provided sufficient information to calculate an effect size between the sanction and recidivism. Studies of treatment services that also employed a sanction were eligible for inclusion in the analysis. Many of the prison-based studies included in the analysis lacked essential descriptive information regarding study methodology (e.g., conditions of confinement).

**Implications:**
- Sanctions on their own do not change offender behavior or reduce recidivism.
- More severe sanctions (i.e., longer prison sentences) may increase recidivism.

#### Implications & Relevant Decision Points

- Plea negotiations
- Sentencing recommendations
- Sentencing decisions

---

A study of 14 Intensive Supervision Demonstration Programs found that a higher percentage of individuals on ISP were incarcerated during the one year follow-up period than the control group. There were no differences in arrests for new crimes between the treatment and control groups. However, ISP was associated with more technical violations: 81% of the ISP offenders had technical violations compared with 33% of those in the control group. In addition, five times as many ISP offenders were returned to prison for technical violations as compared to the control group (21% compared to 4%). The authors also concluded that ISP did not result in cost savings during the one year follow-up period and that ISP ultimately cost 50% more than traditional probation or parole supervision.

**Primary Citation:** Petersilia & Turner (1993)

#### Data Collection

Data were collected in each site on offender demographics, prior criminal history, current offense, and dependence and treatment history. Data on services received, participation in treatment and work programs, and recidivism (technical violations, arrests, and incarceration) were collected at the six- and twelve-month points of supervision.

**Implications:**
- Stringent supervision conditions tend to produce more technical violations and more incarceration and do not reduce recidivism by themselves.

- Plea negotiations
- Sentencing recommendations
- Sentencing decisions
- Community supervision strategy
### MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS

Rigorous and methodologically sound research and meta-analysis that demonstrate null or negative outcomes

A meta-analysis of more than 400 research studies that examined the effects of punishment on recidivism found that punishment produced almost identical effects on recidivism as did no punishment or reduced punishment. This included drug testing, electronic monitoring, fines, intermittent incarceration, restitution, Scared Straight programs, and incarceration.

*Primary Citation:* Gendreau & Goggin (1996)

### METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

While all studies included had a comparison group, the criteria for study inclusion were not provided and no controls were added (e.g., quality of research design, dosage, etc.).

### IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS

*Implications:*
Sanctions on their own do not change offender behavior or reduce recidivism.

- Plea negotiations
- Sentencing recommendations
- Sentencing decisions
- Community intervention strategy
### MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS

Rigorous and methodologically sound research and meta-analyses demonstrating significant positive outcomes

Meta-analyses of more than 100 correctional programs and treatment research studies show that the risk of recidivism is greatly reduced (10–30% on average) when attention is paid to dealing with criminogenic needs (dynamic risk factors, e.g., antisocial attitudes and values, antisocial peers, certain personality and temperamental traits, family and relational factors, substance abuse, employment, school and occupational training, and the use of personal and leisure time). These studies also found that: the most powerful approaches to changing offender behavior include cognitive behavioral and social learning strategies (e.g., modeling, reinforcement, and skill acquisition) in the context of a quality interpersonal relationship; more intensive levels of treatment are most effective with higher risk offenders (the risk principle); intervention efforts should target multiple criminogenic needs (the need principle); and effective interventions are those that are responsive to the motivation, cognitive ability, and other characteristics of the offender (the responsivity principle).

Further findings include: recidivism reduction effects are slightly greater when community-based services and interventions are delivered in the community as compared to services delivered in residential/institutional settings; aftercare and follow-up services that provide a continuum of care are also necessary to manage and prevent relapse; recidivism slightly increased when inappropriate correctional services were provided (i.e., treatment services that do not adhere to the risk, need, and responsivity principles).

These findings hold across community corrections, residential corrections, diversionary programs, males and females, juvenile and adult corrections, restorative and non-restorative justice programs, different types of treatment, and different types of needs targeted.

*Primary Citation: Andrews (2007)*

*Supporting Citations: Andrews & Dowden (2007); Andrews et al. (1990); Andrews & Bonta (2006); Bonta (2007)*

### METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The authors acknowledge that further meta-analytic review on responsivity is needed, and that understanding of the risk principle is still limited by the relatively few studies that report separate effects for lower and higher risk cases.

### IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS

*Implications:*
- Recidivism is more likely reduced when the justice system focuses on criminogenic needs, uses a cognitive behavioral approach, reserves more intensive services for the higher risk offender, and uses aftercare services.
- Charging decision
- Plea negotiations
- Sentencing decision
- Community intervention strategy
### What Works In Reducing Pretrial Misbehavior And Offender Recidivism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS</th>
<th>METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS</th>
<th>IMPLICATIONS &amp; RELEVANT DECISION POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A meta-analysis of more than 800 rigorous program evaluations found that a number of approaches demonstrated a reduction in recidivism rates, including treatment-oriented intensive supervision (22% reduction) compared to no reduction for surveillance-oriented intensive supervision, cognitive behavioral treatment for sex offenders in prison (15%), vocational education in prison (13%), drug treatment in the community (12%), adult drug courts (11%), and cognitive behavioral programs in general (8%). Cognitive behavioral treatment for low risk sex offenders on probation achieved a 31% reduction in recidivism. Overall, cognitive behavioral approaches were consistently found to be more effective in reducing the recidivism rate across a variety of correctional contexts and offender populations. Cost savings were also substantial. Approximate per person cost savings examples include $11,000 for treatment-oriented intensive supervision, $13,700 for vocational education in prison, $10,000 for community drug treatment, and $10,000 for cognitive behavioral approaches. While the absolute differences in the recidivism rates in some situations may have been modest, even small reductions in the rate can have considerable economic and social benefits.  
*Primary Citations: Aos, Miller, & Drake (2006a); Aos, Miller, & Drake (2006b)* | None noted. | Implications: Emphasis should be placed on treatment targets (i.e., criminogenic needs) using a variety of interventions, especially cognitive behavioral programming. Decisions regarding correctional investments should consider the cost/benefit of the intervention.  
- Plea negotiations  
- Sentencing recommendations  
- Sentencing decisions  
- Community supervision strategy  
- Probation/parole violation response |

| A meta-analysis of several hundred studies of criminal justice interventions found that when core correctional practices (e.g., the effective use of authority, modeling and reinforcing prosocial attitudes, teaching concrete problem-solving skills, advocating for community resources, and building a relationship that allows for open communication and respect) were used, particularly in combination with adherence to the risk, need, and responsivity principles, programs had better treatment outcomes than programs that did not use core correctional practices. The findings were particularly true for higher risk cases, programs that targeted criminogenic needs, and clinically appropriate treatment. The findings of the analysis held for various offender and program characteristics. The only core correctional practice that was not associated with significant reductions in rates of reoffending was the effective use of authority.  
*Primary Citation: Dowden & Andrews (2004)*  
*Supporting Citations: Bonta et al. (2008); Trotter (1996)* | None noted. | Implications: Attention to staff characteristics and skills is necessary to enhance outcomes with offenders.  
- Community intervention strategy |
# What Works In Reducing Pretrial Misbehavior And Offender Recidivism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS</th>
<th>METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS</th>
<th>IMPLICATIONS &amp; RELEVANT DECISION POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A meta-analysis of randomized or quasi-experimental studies found that cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT) is effective in reducing recidivism by as much as 25 to 50% under certain conditions. The effects increased when the treatment dosage was increased, when higher risk offenders were targeted, and when the quality of implementation was monitored. The effects held for all brands of curriculum, adult and juvenile offenders, male and female offenders, and minority/non-minority offenders.  
*Primary Citation: Lipsey, Landenberger, & Wilson (2007)*  
*Supporting Citations: Landenberger & Lipsey (2005); Wilson, Bouffard, & MacKenzie (2005)* | The analysis included a limited number of studies by category. | Implications: Programming dosage should match offenders’ risk levels.  
- Plea negotiations  
- Diversion decisions  
- Sentencing decisions  
- Community intervention strategy  
- Probation violation response |
| A synthesis of 18 meta-analyses of correctional interventions found similar results with regard to reducing recidivism. Interventions that utilized "intensive criminal sanctioning" or were exclusively deterrence-based tended to be ineffective or even increased recidivism. On the other hand, there were some interventions that were found to reduce recidivism by an average of 25 to 30%. This group of more effective interventions "predominantly employed behavioral and/or cognitive skills training methods." The overall conclusion was that the programs that work best  
- are founded on an explicit empirically based model of crime causation;  
- have a sound method of assessing risk of reoffending, and offenders are assigned different levels of service and supervision accordingly;  
- contain a sound method of assessing criminogenic needs and dynamic risk factors that are linked to offending;  
- require skilled and structured engagement by staff;  
- utilize cognitive behavioral approaches; and  
- are delivered by personnel who have adequate training and resources.  
*Primary Citation: McGuire (2001)* | None noted. | Implications: Programs designed to reduce recidivism should be monitored through continuous quality improvement techniques to ensure that the program conditions for behavioral change are met.  
- Plea negotiations  
- Sentencing recommendations  
- Sentencing decisions  
- Community supervision strategy |
### What's Promising in Reducing Pretrial Misbehavior and Offender Recidivism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Research Findings</th>
<th>Methodological Considerations</th>
<th>Implications &amp; Relevant Decision Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A study on a sanctions grid used by parole field staff in Ohio to determine the appropriate response to violations of conditions of post-release supervision indicated that moderate and high risk offenders in all supervision categories had a lower likelihood of recidivism after completing a halfway house program. However, low and low/moderate risk offenders recidivated more frequently when they were placed in these higher security settings than into a straight community placement. In addition, offenders in the parole violator category were the only group that experienced a significantly lower level of recidivism across all risk levels when placed in halfway houses.  

*Primary Citation:* Andrews & Janes (2006) | Offenders in a halfway house program were tracked for two years post release to determine the baseline recidivism rate and the characteristics of those most likely to succeed. Based on this research, a supervision grid was created to classify offenders into four risk levels and three supervision categories.  

The article does not provide details on the research methodology. The research was conducted with offenders in one state. | *Implications:* Halfway house interventions with supervision geared to level of risk/need can be effective with higher risk offenders.  
- Low risk offenders may do worse when placed in high security/intensive supervision halfway house programs.  
- Jail or prison release decisions. |
| A randomized experiment exploring drug court monitoring found that offenders assigned to adaptive intervention (i.e., a treatment-oriented response as opposed to a judge-oriented response) were more likely to graduate, had fewer warrants issued, and had more negative drug screens (i.e., clean). The effects were present for both low and high risk offenders, although low risk offenders performed better.  

*Primary Citation:* Marlowe et al. (2008) | The sample size was small—31 offenders. In addition, the experiment was conducted in a single drug court, which makes generalization problematic. | *Implications:* Drug courts should be administered with a treatment orientation.  
- Plea negotiations  
- Sentencing decisions  
- Community intervention strategy  
- Probation violation response |
### MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Studies that show promising outcomes but require rigorous research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A quasi-experimental study compared outcomes between Breaking the Cycle counties and non-Breaking the Cycle counties with a total sample size of 5,600 adult offenders. (Breaking the Cycle is a community-based drug treatment/intervention program designed to address drug-related crime.) The Breaking the Cycle group had a slight but statistically significant lower likelihood of arrest for any offense and significantly fewer drug arrests overall. In the Breaking the Cycle counties that administered more drug tests and sanctions, offenders with drug conditions had a statistically significant lower likelihood of arrest for any offense and significantly fewer drug arrests.  

An analysis of the costs and benefits of the Breaking the Cycle program found that it returned $2.30 to $5.70 for every dollar invested. The conclusion was that the Breaking the Cycle program is an effective strategy for reducing drug arrests for offenders with drug conditions.  

*Primary Citation: Harrell et al. (2003)* |
| A study of 130 low risk and 57 high risk offenders found strong support for the risk principle in drug courts. High risk offenders (who were scheduled to biweekly status hearings) performed better in drug court than those who were assigned to status hearings as usual (they had more negative drug screens and better attendance at counseling sessions).  

*Primary Citation: Marlowe et al. (2006)*  
*Supporting Citations: Lowenkamp, Holsinger, & Latessa (2005)* |
| A study found that the more time a probation officer spent addressing criminogenic needs and using behavioral techniques with probationers, the lower the rate of recidivism. However, only one third of the probation officers spent a significant amount of time in their sessions discussing these needs. Further, the more time spent discussing the conditions of probation, the higher the recidivism rate. In situations where less than 15 minutes were spent discussing probation conditions, the recidivism rate was 19% compared to 42% when more time was devoted to discussing probation conditions.  

*Primary Citation: Bonta et al. (2008)* |

### METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

| The major limitation is the reliance on secondary data, which limited the analyses (for example, there were no data on treatment utilization). In addition, although some of the findings were statistically significant, most observed differences were modest. |
| This was a single site study and there were problems in implementing the intervention model as designed. |

### IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS

| Implications: Programs designed to achieve specific outcomes should be evaluated to determine their effectiveness and overall cost/benefit.  
*• Plea negotiations  
• Sentencing recommendations  
• Sentencing decisions* |
| Implications: Drug court participants should be selected based on risk level (i.e., the risk principle holds in drug court settings).  
*• Diversion decisions  
• Plea negotiations  
• Sentencing decisions  
• Community intervention strategies* |
| Implications: Supervision officers should spend the majority of their time working with offenders on criminogenic needs (rather than focusing on conditions of supervision that are non-criminogenic), use behavioral techniques, and devote at least 15 minutes per session to issues related to criminogenic needs.  
*• Community supervision strategy* |
MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS

What's Promising In Reducing Pretrial Misbehavior And Offender Recidivism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Studies that show promising outcomes but require rigorous research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A study found that judges who used bail guidelines were more consistent in their decision making regarding release on recognizance than judges who did not use bail guidelines. The judges who used guidelines were more likely to grant ROR to non-seriously charged defendants and to be more stringent with defendants facing more serious charges than the control group, who lacked this level of consistency in their decisions. In addition, with regard to defendants classified within the cash bail decision group in the guidelines, 65% of the judges who used guidelines set bail in this range, while only 38% of the judges in the control group set bail similarly. The equity of bail decisions involves decision making in which one would expect “similarly situated” defendants to be treated in a similar manner, which was confirmed by this study. The variation in bail amounts was substantially reduced among the judges using guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This was an experimental study of bail guidelines looking at 960 cases and conducted over a 14-month period. Judges were randomly assigned to an experimental group, which would use bail guidelines, or a comparison group, which would set bail decisions as they had in the past.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications: Providing judicial officers with objective information about offenders’ backgrounds and community ties (as well as about the charges against the defendant) coupled with the use of a validated instrument helps produce more equitable and effective pretrial decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Citation: Goldkamp &amp; Gottfredson (1985)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPLICATIONS &amp; RELEVANT DECISION POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implications: Drug courts should consider adopting a pre-plea or post-plea model, providing offenders with incentives for completion, and using cognitive behavioral techniques.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Diversion decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Plea negotiations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sentencing recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sentencing decisions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A review of 50 studies (of 55 drug courts) found that the recidivism rate (for both drug and non-drug offenses) was lower on average for drug court participants than for those in the comparison group (38% compared to 50%). Three studies that used random assignment and did not have a high participant attrition rate demonstrated a reduction from 50% to 43%. In addition, other studies that used a group of eligible but non-referred offenders as the comparison group also observed a moderate reduction in reoffending.

Programs that used either a pre-plea or post-plea model were more effective than those that employed a mixed model. Moreover, programs that offered a clear incentive for completion (e.g., dismissal of charges) had greater success than those that did not. Finally, drug courts that used a single dedicated provider were more successful because they were more likely to use a cognitive behavioral model.

Primary Citation: Wilson, Mitchell, & MacKenzie (2006)
### MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS

Studies that show promising outcomes but require rigorous research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodological Considerations</th>
<th>Implications &amp; Relevant Decision Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A meta-analysis of 140 studies of community (intermediate) sanctions and 325 studies of incarceration found that, for intermediate sanctions, there appeared to be a “net widening” effect through the targeting of individuals who would not have previously received as severe a sanction. In addition, there was no indication that these more severe sanctions were more effective than traditional community supervision. In the 47 studies of intensive supervision included in this review, there was no difference between the groups, with each having a recidivism rate of 29%. However, there was an indication that the inclusion of a treatment component with the intensive supervision program resulted in a 10% reduction in recidivism.

The analysis of whether longer periods of incarceration produced lower recidivism rates included two components: one comparing similar offenders who spent more time (averaging over 30 months) in prison compared with less (averaging less than 17 months) and the second comparing offenders who were sent to prison for a brief time with a similar group not receiving a prison sentence. Neither of these analyses exhibited different effects on recidivism.  

*Primary Citation:* Gendreau, Goggin, Cullen, & Andrews (2001)  

| Methodological rigor was not included as a criterion for inclusion in the meta-analysis.  

**Implications:** Intermediate sanctions should be utilized with recognition of both their ability to achieve certain outcomes and their limitations, such as accountability as opposed to risk reduction. Careful controls should be put in place when implementing intermediate sanctions to avoid unintended net widening.  

- Plea negotiations  
- Sentencing recommendations  
- Sentencing decisions

| A meta-analysis of 131 studies for almost 750,000 adult offenders found that the strongest predictors of recidivism proved to be criminogenic need, criminal history/history of antisocial behavior, social achievement, age/gender/race, and family factors. Both static and dynamic predictors proved important. Overall, validated risk assessment instruments proved to be superior to static measures and indices of antisociality. Early family factors and pre-adult antisocial behavior are correlated with recidivism but are rarely included in adult offender risk assessments. Focus on personal distress, social class, and, to a lesser extent, intelligence is contraindicated based on the empirical evidence.  

*Primary Citation:* Gendreau, Goggin, & Little (1996)  

*Supporting Citation:* Andrews et al. (1990); French & Gendreau (2003)  

The studies included in the meta-analysis had an over-representation of males in their samples.  

**Implications:** Validated risk assessments should be used and include both static and dynamic risk factors.  

- Charging decisions  
- Diversion decisions  
- Plea negotiations  
- Sentencing recommendations  
- Sentencing decisions  
- Community intervention strategy
### What's Promising in Reducing Pretrial Misbehavior and Offender Recidivism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS</th>
<th>METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS</th>
<th>IMPLICATIONS &amp; RELEVANT DECISION POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A meta-analysis of 70 prison-based treatment studies found higher effect sizes resulting from behavioral programs and programs with greater integrity in terms of implementation. In particular, programs that targeted criminogenic needs had increased effects on recidivism, which increased with the number of criminogenic needs targeted. Overall, the study found that misconduct was reduced by about 26% through programming.</td>
<td>The meta-analysis had few studies of women offenders, and it did not control for factors that have been demonstrated to influence misconduct (i.e., prison overcrowding, population instability through transfers, security level, etc.). The authors note that important offender characteristics (risk, need, misconduct history) may moderate the findings.</td>
<td><strong>Implications:</strong> Enhanced prison management will result through a strategy in which programming has a central role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Primary Citation:</em> French &amp; Gendreau (2003)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Sentencing decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Correctional programming decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A summary of 30 meta-analyses found that overall treatment reduces recidivism about 9–10%, and slightly higher for “appropriate” services, when the program is matched to the offender’s unique traits; community programs have greater effect sizes; there is some influence of age of offenders on recidivism outcome; and larger effect sizes are derived from programs with higher risk offenders.</td>
<td>This is a summary of evaluation studies and does not have any controls. In addition, evaluations of juvenile programs are over-represented in the summary, as are males.</td>
<td><strong>Implications:</strong> Treatment programming should be targeted to higher risk offenders and their criminogenic needs, and preferably (though not exclusively) be community based.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Primary Citation:</em> McGuire (2002)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Plea negotiations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Supporting Citation:</em> French &amp; Gendreau (2003)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Sentencing recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Sentencing decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Community intervention strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## What's Promising In Reducing Pretrial Misbehavior And Offender Recidivism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS</strong></th>
<th><strong>METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS</strong></th>
<th><strong>IMPLICATIONS &amp; RELEVANT DECISION POINTS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studies that show promising outcomes but require rigorous research</td>
<td>This is not a research project that makes statistical inferences to a larger population; however, the discussion is supported by citation of numerous individual studies.</td>
<td><strong>Implications:</strong> Immediacy, fairness, consistency, and proportionality in responding to misbehavior are important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The effectiveness of graduated sanctions in deterring non-compliant acts is contingent on the certainty, swiftness, and fairness (consistency and proportionality) of the response. In addition, the supervision process must be proactive and have the following critical elements: (a) it must inform the offender about the behavior that constitutes an infraction and about the potential consequence for that behavior, (b) it must ensure that the judiciary, supervision agents, and other treatment agencies adhere to the sanctioning model, and (c) it must uphold the offender’s dignity throughout the process of change. Thus, a sound graduated sanctions model should clearly define infractions, utilize a swift process for responding to infractions, respond to sanctions using a structured sanction menu with consequences, and employ behavioral contracts for offenders with written offender acknowledgement of violation behavior.</td>
<td><strong>Implications:</strong> By assessing risk, decision makers are able to base the use of pretrial detention and release conditions on level of risk.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Primary Citation:</em> Taxman, Soule, &amp; Gelb (1999)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A study predicting risk using an assessment instrument for pretrial populations examined the following factors: charge type, pending charges, outstanding warrants, prior convictions, prior failures to appear, prior violent convictions, length of time at current residence, employment status, and history of drug abuse. Statistical analysis showed that the instrument seemed to predict equally across gender, race, and geographic location. The study found that not only did the instrument predict for failure to appear (i.e., high risk defendants were less likely to appear), but it also predicted for danger to the community (i.e., higher risk defendants were more likely to be arrested pretrial) and for failure due to technical violations (i.e., higher risk defendants were more likely to have technical violations). A similar test in Federal Court found that offenders with different risk levels may respond to pretrial conditions differently. In addition, most conditions did not have an impact on recidivism risk for low risk offenders. This finding is supported by another study of Federal District Court in the District of Columbia.</td>
<td>There is no measure of association between risk score and outcome (e.g., failure to appear or rearrest). In the Federal study, there were no data on fulfillment of conditions or the quality of services.</td>
<td><strong>Implications:</strong> Pretrial release decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Primary Citations:</em> VanNostrand (2003); VanNostrand &amp; Keebler (2009)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Citation: Winterfield, Coggeshall, &amp; Harrell (2003)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

There is no measure of association between risk score and outcome (e.g., failure to appear or rearrest). In the Federal study, there were no data on fulfillment of conditions or the quality of services.

**Implications:**
- Community intervention strategy
- Probation/parole violation response
### MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS

Findings that contradict or conflict with other studies and require additional rigorous research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Methodological Considerations</th>
<th>Implications &amp; Relevant Decision Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A study of 2,014 adult and juvenile offenders in five sites found that offenders placed in the Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime (TASC) program had lower drug use in three of the five sites studied. Two of the sites reported fewer drug crimes based on self-report data, and there was no difference in reoffending in three sites. In addition, TASC offenders performed worse in terms of new arrests and technical violations in two sites.  
*Primary Citation: Anglin, Longshore, & Turner (1999)* | The follow-up period was only six months. Also, the comparisons of TASC were made to other interventions or probation rather than a treatment/no treatment comparison. | Implications: Not applicable  
- Plea negotiations  
- Sentencing recommendation  
- Sentencing decisions  
- Community supervision strategy |
| A randomized experiment on the effects of drug testing during pretrial release on offender misconduct found there was no statistically significant difference between the treatment and control groups with regard to failure to appear or rearrest. The overall conclusion is that the use of drug testing during the pretrial period did not significantly reduce pretrial misconduct.  
*Primary Citation: Britt, Gottfredson, & Goldkamp (1992)* | There was significant attrition in both study sites. In addition, in one of the sites, 20% of the treatment group did not receive a drug test and, among other individuals, the amount of testing was varied. As such, there are concerns about the integrity of the intervention. | Implications: Not applicable  
- Pretrial release decisions |
| A study of 1,378 defendants from 12 urban and rural counties in North Carolina found that the seriousness of charges and the presence of codefendants influenced the final disposition. The seriousness of charges affected the severity of the sentence for defendants who were found guilty. The presence of codefendants increased the odds of dismissal for Class 1 felony defendants. Defendants’ prior criminal history did not affect odds of dismissal but did increase severity of sentencing. Black defendants charged with Class 2 felonies were more likely to have longer stays in pretrial detention. Longer time in pretrial detention influenced court disposition. Whether the defendant had a private versus public defender did not affect the likelihood of charges being dismissed. Plea bargaining was related to the length of sentence for moderate to high risk groups (where risk is related to detention).  
*Primary Citation: Clarke & Kurtz (1983)* | Risk was defined as the probability of detention, not the probability of future reoffending. | Implications: Not applicable  
- Charging decisions  
- Plea negotiations  
- Pretrial release decisions |