
**JAIL SANCTIONS:
RECOMMENDATIONS TO INCREASE
JAIL-BASED TREATMENT**

Approved: Dr. Susan Hilal

Date: August 12, 2020

JAIL SANCTIONS: RECOMMENDATIONS TO INCREASE JAIL-BASED TREATMENT

A Seminar Paper

Presented to

The Graduate Faculty

University of Wisconsin – Platteville

In Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science

In

Criminal Justice

By

Constance J. Hewitt

Abstract

Purpose: On the heels of mass incarceration, one of the primary goals in community corrections, otherwise referred to as probation and/or parole, is to reduce the use of incarceration as a punitive measure and to focus on offender rehabilitation. However, because community corrections also a responsibility to uphold public safety, jail sanctions or short-term incarceration is often utilized as a tool of supervision in response to violations. The purpose of this research is to assess the effectiveness of jail sanctions and whether implementing a treatment program during that sanction helps increase the effectiveness of that sanction by further reducing offender recidivism and/or probation failure.

Methods: In a review of secondary research and statistics, this paper addresses the current state of community corrections practices, the application of jail sanctions as violation responses, as well as the treatment programs that are currently available within local jail jurisdictions.

Findings: Information presented in the paper show that jail sanctions, despite research showing no significant impact on recidivism, are still heavily utilized for many reasons, but specifically as responses to probation violations. Further, treatment programs, although mostly linked to reductions in offender recidivism, are scarce and widely underutilized in local jails. This paper will conclude with recommendations to continue the use of Evidence-Based Practices (EBPs) and increase the use of treatment programs within local jails.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract.....	iii
Table of Contents.....	iv
Section I: Introduction.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	1
Purpose of the Study.....	2
Significance of the Study.....	3
Method of Approach.....	3
Limitations.....	3
Contribution to the Field.....	4
Section II: Literature Review.....	5
Incarceration Rates.....	5
Evidence-Based Practices.....	6
Risk Principle.....	7
Need Principle.....	7
Responsivity Principle.....	8
Good Lives Model.....	9
Factors Contributing to Offender Success.....	10
Employment.....	10
Education.....	11
Substance Abuse.....	12
Use of Jail Sanctions.....	14
Treatment Offered in Local Jails.....	16
Substance Abuse.....	16
Cognitive-Behavior Therapy (CBT).....	17
Vocation/Education.....	19
Conclusions.....	19
Section III: Theoretical Framework.....	21
Introduction.....	21
Social Bonding Theory.....	21
Application of Social Bonding Theory.....	23
Conclusions.....	24

Section IV: Recommendations	25
Section V: Summary and Conclusions	28
REFERENCES.....	30

SECTION I: INTRODUCTION

In response to the mass incarceration epidemic across the United States, many state criminal justice reform efforts have involved a diversion of offenders into noncustodial options, most commonly the use of probation and parole, also known as community supervision (Phelps, 2013). The number of people on correctional supervision in the United States, while at the lowest it has been since 1999, still accounts for nearly .014 percent (4,537,100 adults in 2016) of the total adult population in the U.S. (Kaeble, 2018). Further, information from The Council of State Governments (CSG) Justice Center (2017) shows that 11 percent of probationers and 14 percent of parolees have been returned to prison for technical violations, which accounts for nearly a quarter of all state prison admissions. Given these numbers, state governments are under increased public pressure to reduce mass incarceration and crimeless revocations, which has led state community corrections officials to evaluate their correctional practices and develop new strategies to enhance offender rehabilitation while still maintaining public safety.

Statement of the Problem

In response to the cry for corrections reform, many states have begun to implement the strategies of Evidence-based Practices (EBP). Under this concept, probation and parole agents utilize the risk-need-responsivity (RNR) model to tailor treatment and conditions for offenders based on criminal risk and criminogenic need factors in an effort to reduce recidivism (Wooditch, Tang, & Taxman, 2014). A major component of this is the use of incentives and sanctions for their behaviors. Sanctions, like incarceration, are often a necessity of correctional supervision because probationers/parolees must be given swift, certain, and proportionate responses to violations or inappropriate behavior in order to reinforce behavior change. Keeping in line with the theory of operant conditioning (McLeod, 2018), people respond better and retain

learned behaviors for longer periods of time when receiving higher levels of positive reinforcement. However, these incentives should be in conjunction with the administration of swift, certain, and appropriate responses for negative and unacceptable behavior so as not to undermine the punishment aspect (Guevara & Solomon, 2009).

In order to allow offenders to be productive during incarceration, many agencies have begun to implement treatment responses into their jail sanctions as well. The purpose of this is to engage offenders in skill building while incarcerated rather than having them just do their time. Offenders work to address their criminogenic needs, which in turn helps to further reduce recidivism. Additionally, these treatment programs can offer incentives to some offenders to get out of custody earlier, after successful completion of the program or required dosage hours. Research is conflicting on whether or not the use of jail-based treatment programs is effective. Generally speaking, most studies suggest that treatment helps to reduce recidivism (Rothbard, Wald, Zubritsky, Jaquette, & Chhatre, 2009; Wooditch, Tang, & Taxman, 2014). However, limited research shows the effectiveness of these types of programs as a response to probation violations (Linhorst, Dirks-Linhorst & Groom, 2012).

Purpose of the Study

Community corrections is moving in the direction of rehabilitation and is focusing on the use of EBP to reduce offender recidivism and increase public safety. Several states have been working to implement the eight strategies of EBP, including in their responses to violations, which can include community-based sanctions or jail sanctions. However, with the current demand for criminal justice reform and concerns over mass incarceration and crimeless revocations, it is a good time to evaluate if the use of jail-based treatment as an intermediate sanction is appropriate and working towards the goals of offender rehabilitation. The purpose of

this research is to assess the effectiveness of jail sanctions and whether implementing a treatment program during that sanction helps increase the effectiveness of that sanction by further reducing offender recidivism and/or probation failure.

Significance of the Study

If the use of jail-based treatment can help increase the reduction of recidivism, community corrections would gain valuable insight that can help guide policy and procedures. Correctional agencies will be better able to evaluate how and when they utilize jail sanctions or incarceration in response to violations. Also, corrections could look to implement more treatment options into these periods of incarceration, which would better serve the marginalized population they serve. Similarly, this research would provide insight and, hopefully, fill gaps in the research related to the use of jail sanctions as it relates to probation and parole violations.

Method of Approach

The method of approach for this research is the collection and review of secondary research and statistics in order to review empirical findings from a number of sources, including scholarly peer-reviewed journal articles, credible websites, and government websites. In addition, a review of current programs available in the United States, with emphasis in Wisconsin, will also be conducted. This information will then be analyzed to support the assertion that the reduction of recidivism can be better attained from jail-based treatment for offenders serving a sanction for probation violations.

Limitations

Despite the amount of information contained within this paper, there are also limitations to what can be evaluated. Firstly, this study does not address any of the motivations, attitudes, or beliefs held by any of the offenders, which could also greatly impact their success rates of probation, whether they served a jail sanction or not. As Wooditch et al. (2014) has pointed out,

treatment may only address a few of the criminogenic need areas. More research is needed to explore what impacts the other non-criminogenic need areas have on recidivism rates or how treatment combined with EBPs can increase offender success. Additionally, this method is limited because some of the needed data simply does not exist at this time. While a few studies have directly examined probation jail sanctions (Linhorst et al., 2012; Wodahl et al., 2015), they do not address the addition of treatment programs during the jail sanction. Similarly, of the information that does address specific jail-based programs, the data is often small in size and centralized in a small geographical area, which reduces external validity (Withrow, 2016).

Another limitation to this study is that the data obtained for secondary analysis are focused on several types of programming administered in a jail setting. It is difficult to compare the success rates of multiple types of offenders (i.e. drug abusers, those engaging in domestic violence, or those with poor thinking patterns) as each group of offenders may face unique barriers to overcoming that particular need area. Further research into comparisons of programming being administered would be helpful to determine which programs offer the greatest reduction in recidivism.

Contribution to the Field

This research would help to provide insight into whether specific programming can be used to increase offender success rates, within the scope of evidence-based practices, in both re-arrest rates and probation failure (i.e. revocation). This information could be used to suggest recommendations for change and/or include recommendations to improve or continue the programs as they are currently being implemented. Additionally, agencies would be able to evaluate implementation strategies with the goal of providing offenders continued support and services, even while serving sanctions for violations.

SECTION II: LITERATURE REVIEW

The following section is divided into five parts. The first section begins with an overview of the current state of incarceration rates. This is followed by an explanation of current correctional practices, focusing on the use of Evidence-Based Practices and how these principles are applied in managing criminal behaviors. The third part then discusses additional factors that contribute to an offender's success as well. Included in parts four and five is a description of jail sanctions and treatment programs available during jail incarceration.

Incarceration Rates

According to recent U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) publications, by the end of 2018, the U.S. had approximately 1.47 million people incarcerated in either federal or state prisons. While this number is down by 1.6% from the previous year, and the lowest incarceration rate since 1996, the number of prison releases was also down. In 2018, about 614,800 prisoners were released back into the society, which was down 8,200 from the previous year. Of these, about 72% (443,300) of these releases were to post-custody community supervision (Carson, 2020). With intensive rules of supervision, and many more obstacles to face, people on supervision are bound to make mistakes. Unfortunately, those mistakes can and do often result in jail sanctions and/or revocation of supervision, which ultimately will have them re-incarcerated into the prison system. In 2018, nearly a third (30%) of state and 10% of federal admissions were due to violations of community supervision (Carson, 2020). Furthermore, in a 5-year, post-release analysis, the BJS found that about two-thirds (67.8%) of those released committed a new crime within three years, and 76.6% were re-arrested within five years. Additionally, over half (56.7%) of all persons who re-offended within five years after their release were arrested within the first year (Durose, Cooper, & Snyder, 2014).

While those numbers are staggering, it is a similar situation for incarceration rates within county or local jails. In 2018, in the U.S., there were approximately 2,800 local jail jurisdictions in operation, housing over 700,000 inmates. Of these, about 16,000 (roughly 2%), were held for probation and parole violations. Of the remaining inmates, 68% were being held for felony charges and 26% for misdemeanors. Additionally, about one-third (34%) were already sentenced or awaiting sentencing for their conviction and the remaining 66% were pending court actions on their open cases. However, the overall jail incarceration rate has dropped approximately 12% since 2008 (Zeng, 2020).

While the reasons for these high numbers are debated, the fact remains that many prisons and jails are being over-crowded and there is little research to support that incarceration is beneficial to rehabilitation. Still, a large percentage of inmates released back into the community are re-incarcerated or put into jail sanctions while on community supervision.

Evidence-Based Practices

In corrections today, many agencies are moving away from the ideas of “best practices” or “what works” and are shifting to what is called Evidence-based Practices (EBP). These principles are an objective and balanced approach to applying current research and empirical evidence to guide policy development and decision-making. First utilized in the medical and social sciences, EBPs were designed to focus on definable, measurable, and practical outcomes instead of anecdotal or professional experiences (National Institute of Corrections, n.d.). The goal in utilizing these research-based practices is to achieve greater offender success and lower recidivism rates while increasing public safety.

There are eight (8) guiding principles of EBP, which include: 1) a risk and needs assessment; 2) enhancing offender motivation to change; 3) targeting interventions; 4) skill

training with directed practice; 5) increase positive reinforcements; 6) engaging ongoing community support; 7) measuring relevant processes and practices; and 8) measurement of feedback (National Institute of Corrections, n.d.). These EBP principles were developed using the Risk-Need-Responsivity (RNR) concepts established by Donald Andrews and James Bonta in 1990. This concept was formulated based on decades of research which established that the best criminal justice outcomes were achieved when supervision levels are matched to participants' risk for criminal recidivism (criminogenic risk) and their interventions focus on specific conditions that are responsible for participants' crimes (criminogenic needs). However, these need areas can be influenced by responsivity factors (barriers), which must be considered as well when deriving an offender case plan or direction for supervision (National Institute of Corrections, n.d.). Thus, this RNR model is focused on the three principles: the risk principle, the need principle and the responsivity principle (Andrews & Bonta, 2007).

Risk Principle

Under this principle, Andrews and Bonta (1998) determined that criminal behavior can be predicted and, based on these predictions, effective levels of service or supervision could be applied to generate the best outcomes. Through a number of different studies, Andrews and Bonta (1998) acknowledged that higher-risk offenders would benefit the most from more intensive services whereas lower-risk offenders only needed minimal or no intervention to obtain success. Similarly, mixing offenders with different levels of risk/need could increase recidivism rates, substance use, and other undesirable outcomes (National Institute for Corrections, n.d.) because lower-risk offenders were exposed to negative peers and beliefs.

Need Principle

This principle identifies the need areas which, if targeted with appropriate treatments, will decrease the offender's likelihood of re-offending. These identified criminogenic need areas

are a subset of the offender's risk factors and, unlike non-criminogenic need areas, can affect the probability of recidivism. Both types of need areas are dynamic and changeable; however, non-criminogenic needs are not associated with re-offending. Andrews and Bonta (1998) outlined the Central Eight criminogenic needs, which have been associated with offender recidivism. These are broken down into the "Big Four", which originally included anti-social cognition, anti-social peers, anti-social personality, and a history of anti-social behaviors. The "moderate four" were listed as family/marital, substance abuse, employment/education and leisure (Andrews & Bonta, 1998). Over time, these have changed some, in terms of their placement within the hierarchy, but generally have stayed the same. Andrews and Bonta (2007) also outline non-criminogenic needs as areas that, which changeable, do not directly impact recidivism rates, unless they affect one of the Central Eight. Specific non-criminogenic needs can include self-esteem, mental health concerns or physical health. In many cases, these non-criminogenic needs can be addressed when discussed as a responsivity issue.

Responsivity Principle

This principle relates to the administration of treatment in a style and mode which is congruent with an offender's ability and learning style. Responsivity factors, also generally referred to as barriers, can affect how offenders are able to actively work on their criminogenic needs. However, when discussing this principle, it is important to note that there are two parts of responsivity: general and specific. General responsivity rests on the notion that all offenders are human beings and are most influenced by cognitive-behavioral and cognitive social learning strategies. This part identifies that strategies such as modeling, skill building, cognitive restructuring, practice and the appropriate use of positive reinforcements and disapproval are effective in bringing about positive change (Andrews & Bonta, 1998; Andrews & Bonta, 2007).

Essentially, general responsivity applies treatment which is applicable to the general population of human beings.

On the other hand, specific responsivity identifies specific barriers unique to each offender. Any interventions applied in a treatment response are going to consider the individual strengths, learning style, interpersonal skills, mental health concerns, motivation, and bio-social characteristics (Andrews & Bonta, 2007). Addressing these specific areas can improve the offender's willingness and acceptance of treatment as well as their ability to comprehend the skills that are being taught to them. Essentially, it personalizes each treatment to the individual to make it more effective.

Good Lives Model

While the RNR model encompasses a great deal of areas for assessment, new ideas are forming that attempt to improve upon its basis. More recently, the Good Lives Model (GLM) has become more popular and is seen by some as an alternative to RNR. GLM is a strengths-based approach to offender rehabilitation which is founded on the ethical concept of human dignity and universal human rights. According to this model, individuals engage in criminal activities because they seek a valued outcome in their life. As such, individual's intrinsic motivation to achieve a goal, which is inherently human and normal, unfortunately manifests itself into harmful behaviors, due to a range of deficits within the offender and their environments. The GLM hypothesizes that by improving personal fulfillment there will be a natural reduction in criminogenic needs. Therefore, intervention should be focused on cultivating an individual's personal functioning rather than focusing on eliminating or managing problems (Good Lives Model, n.d.). Recent evaluations of this model by RNR creators concluded that GLM adds little

substance to the concepts of RNR; however, GLM's positive, strength-based focus has a greater appeal with clinicians in the recent years (Andrews, Bonta, & Wormith, 2011).

What this does add is that a reduction in recidivism rates is dependent on increasing an offender's success in the community through treatment or interventions, which are tailored to individual needs. Utilization of an effective risk and needs assessment is paramount in setting the road map for recovery, but agencies must also be working to increase an offender's motivation, skills base, and positive connections to community supports as well as providing positive reinforcement to encourage positive behavior change. However, what the RNR model and EBPs do not outright address is the role that incarceration plays in responses to violations of probation or continued criminal behaviors.

Factors Contributing to Offender Success

Employment

Employment is a critical success factor in offender reentry; however, it is a barrier that is often difficult to overcome. According to the National Institute of Justice (2013), it is estimated that between 60-75% of ex-offenders remain unemployed for up to a year after their release. The research also suggests that this is mostly due to employers who are reluctant to hire individuals with a criminal background; as nearly 87% of employers conduct criminal background checks on their applicants (Vallas & Dietrich, 2014). Additionally, Pager, Western and Sugie (2009) found that having a criminal background reduces the likelihood of a callback or job offer from 28% to 15%. The negative effect of a criminal conviction is also substantially larger for blacks (60%) than for whites (30%). However, Pager et al. (2009) also found that those who were able to interact with potential employers were four to six times more likely to receive a callback or job offer. Likewise, personal contact reduced the effect of a criminal record by about 15%. More

needs to be done to help prepare ex-offenders for job interviews and maximize their potential during their first impressions to employers.

The research on how employment impacts recidivism rates is scarce, and results have been mixed. Ramakers, Nieuwbeerta, Van Wilsem, and Dirkzwager (2017) provided an overview of longitudinal studies and found that, while several criminological or psychological theories imply the protective role of employment, limited research on this is available and has mixed results on its actual impact on recidivism. Additionally, most studies available utilize a simplistic measurement range (employed versus unemployed) and ignores the characteristics of job quality, which is what most theories posit the benefits of employment are conditional upon. In a further review, Ramakers et al. (2017) found that employment alone was not enough to reduce recidivism, but particularly stable jobs at a higher occupational level could help reduce re-offending rates among high-risk offenders. The caveat being that many offenders have below average job skills or “a human capital deficit” that prevents them from obtaining high-quality jobs.

Education

Education has also been shown to reduce recidivism and ensure positive offender success; yet, approximately two-fifths of prison and jail inmates lack a high school diploma or GED and among those who have a diploma/GED, an additional 46% have not had any postsecondary education (Vallas & Dietrich, 2014). More importantly, based on the 2003 National Assessment of Adult Literacy survey, incarcerated adults have higher illiteracy rates than those who are non-incarcerated. In the three areas considered (prose literacy, document literacy, and quantitative literacy), incarcerated adults had 50-78% of their population in the “basic” or “below basic” categories (Michon, 2016). Research also shows that inmates’ primary

reasoning for dropping out of school before graduating include: 1) involvement in criminal activities and/or the correctional system (15.9%); 2) family/personal problems (16.4%); 3) academic/behavioral problems or loss of interest (34.9%); and 4) economic reasons for leaving school, including going to work, joining the military, or financial problems (21.8%) (Harlow, 2003).

Improving inmates' access to education prior to release from prison, as well as getting them connected to educational opportunities in the community upon release, can help to reduce the likelihood of reoffending. In one study, recidivism rates were reduced significantly when inmates were exposed to at least 200 hours of academic programming while in the institution. The most substantial of these groups occurred with inmates who had an initial reading level below 3.9, which led to recidivism rates reduced by nearly one third (from 26.6% to 18.1% respectively) (Adams, Bennett, Flanagan, Marquart, Cuvelier, Fritsch, Gerber, Longmire & Burton, 1994). A meta-analysis done by Hall (2015) also supports that increasing participation and, more importantly, the completion of educational programs as this has a significant impact on recidivism reduction.

Substance Abuse

Substance use or addiction is also a significant barrier to offender stability. In 2002, an estimated 66% of jail inmates reported regular alcohol use and 68.7% reported regular illicit drug use (SAMHSA/CSAT, 2005). By 2009, it was estimated that nearly half of all incarcerated individuals met the criteria for a diagnosis of drug abuse or dependence (55% local jails and 53% state prisons); yet, only 7% of local jail inmates and 15% of state prison inmates received substance abuse treatment while incarcerated (Chandler, Fletcher, & Volkow, 2009). While it appears that the presence of substance abuse diagnoses is lower than reported use, it still presents

a staggering barrier for most offenders. This poses an ample opportunity for jails to provide intervention because most local jails are the first opportunity for offenders to identify their substance use disorders, have their acute needs stabilized, and to receive initiation of or referrals to treatment, either in-house or in the community (SAMHSA/CSAT, 2005).

While drug education and self-help groups are more prevalent in state prisons, with over a quarter of state inmates able to participate in Alcoholics Anonymous or other similar groups while incarcerated (Chandler et al., 2009), participation in formal substance abuse treatment programs while incarcerated is paramount to offender success. Chandler et al. (2009) noted that individuals who participated in treatment within an institution, in conjunction with a community-based program after release, were seven times more likely to abstain from drug use. Further, participants were three times less likely to re-offend than those who did not receive any treatment. Additionally, those engaging in drug courts were found to have re-arrest rates about half those of comparison groups or drug court dropouts. In looking at local jails, studies show that treated inmates have reductions in rearrests ranging from 5-25% and have a greater time gap between release from incarceration and re-arrest. Additionally, reduction in relapse rates, lower levels of depression and fewer disciplinary actions are positively associated with in-jail treatment (SAMHSA/CSAT, 2005). These are considerable decreases to reflect on and, again, show that increasing treatment participation while incarcerated is important to offender rehabilitation.

Focusing on these need areas alone, research tells us that exposure to treatment or skill building while incarcerated can lead to a decrease in recidivism. Wooditch et al. (2014) explored the effectiveness of treatment on criminogenic need areas and found that participation in treatment elucidated significant change across a few need areas; however, they found that participants who attended at least 18 cognitive-behavioral treatment sessions had the most

dramatic declines in substance use. Rothbard et al. (2009) also found that in-jail treatment for co-occurring disorders could also increase street time and, if given enough dosage hours, could reduce re-offending for long periods of time. The study involved an average of 8.5 weeks of treatment, but researchers recommended a longer period of treatment because a higher number of treatment sessions was significant in reducing re-incarceration.

Use of Jail Sanctions

Much of the literature on the use of jail sanctions as a response to probation violations support the idea that jail sanctions are ineffective and disruptive to offenders' lives. While Cochran, Mears and Bales (2013) found that less severe sanctions such as probation, instead of lengthy prison sentences, are more effective in reducing recidivism, they posit this is likely because more severe sanctions offer less support and fewer services. Similarly, Judicial Review of Probation Conditions (1967) asserted that the release of offenders under conditions imposed by the court, "may help to rehabilitate the offender, deter further criminal behavior...and satisfy the community's desire for retribution." However, many (Dirr, 2019; Phelps, 2013; Sawyer & Wagner, 2020) believe that the conditions of supervision are abstruse and result in excessive technical violations, for which offenders are placed in custody instead of being given other types of intermediate sanctions in the community. Dirr (2019) reports that in 2018 alone, agents in Wisconsin ordered approximately 45,000 probation holds, or jail sanctions for violations of the rules of supervision, and more than one-third of those cases were for alleged rule violations.

By definition, technical infractions typically include an offender's failure to comply with curfews or alcohol and drug screenings, attend meetings with their agents, make restitution payments, complete community service hours, attend individual and/or group treatment, etc. Additionally, research shows that discretionary decision-making by probation/parole agents can

often yield different results for offenders who violate similar rules. Depending on which state or jurisdiction, some offenders on supervision can remain in the community, simply with added restrictions, while others will face formal hearings or potential sanctions, including revocation, for similar rule violations (Kerbs, Jones, & Jolley, 2009). The difference in decisions can, according to some research, be the difference in success rates as some support the idea that incarceration as a sanction is no better than a community-based sanction at reducing recidivism. In a 2015 study, Wodahl, Boman and Garland determined the following: 1) jail sanctions are not significantly related to the number of days between violations; 2) jail sanctions do not significantly affect the number of subsequent violations an offender; and 3) jail sanctions do not reach a statistically significant influence on successful completion of the identified ISP program. Overall, Wodahl et al. (2015) found there is no evidence to suggest that jail sanctions are any more or less effective than community-based graduated sanctions in promoting offender compliance. Additionally, Wodahl et al. (2015) found that the number of times an offender went to jail, the number of days spent in jail and the timing of the jail sanction also did not influence the offender outcomes.

Warren (2007) also posits that incarceration, in general, can result in a slight increase in offender recidivism rates due to unnecessary disruptions in their ability to obtain or maintain stability within the community. Williams et al. (2019) supports this as well indicating that incarceration, even for short periods, can be very disruptive to people's lives. The article posits that even short-term jail sanctions can jeopardize the stability of an offender's employment, housing, family ties, and even their health, which are all associated with and promote positive re-integration and individual well-being. Offenders often already face tremendous obstacles in these areas, which gives them a disadvantage to successful reintegration. However, interrupting

their progress with unnecessary or incessant jail sanctions only furthers their ability to become positive, pro-social contributing members to the community.

Treatment Offered in Local Jails

The following is an overview of programs that are being run in local jails which address substance abuse, cognitive-behavioral treatment, and vocation/educational programs.

Information on specific programs is limited as there is no central database that houses this data and must be obtained from individual local jail jurisdictions. However, examples are included when this information could be found.

Substance Abuse

The primary difficulties in assessing this type of treatment program in a jail setting is time and type of treatment provided. Time constraints, both in what is available for inmates to participate in treatment and, often, the short duration of the inmates' incarceration, can impact treatment effectiveness. Similarly, there is no single, defined model of treatment which has been outlined, which leads to more of a range which can be available. Brief interventions (for inmates in custody less than 30 days) usually will only consist of providing motivational interviewing, basic assessments, and community referrals for long-term continuity of care. Short-term treatments (for inmates in custody 1-3 months) builds on the first level, but usually includes components which address identifying triggers, teaching coping/social skills as well as problem-solving, and developing strong community-based support groups. The third level, which focuses on inmates who are in custody more than 90 days, is like residential programs in the community. They incorporate pieces of the other levels, but also attempt to focus on personal values/belief systems (anti-social cognition) and matters related to familial backgrounds (family/marital) that have continued to enable their addiction lifestyle (SAMHSA/CSAT, 2005).

Despite the time and program obstacles, participation rates in treatment programs while incarcerated vary depending on the level described. According to the BJS, only 6% of inmates who reported use a month before incarceration participated in formal treatment, while 13.6% participated in other programs like self-help groups or drug education in 2002 (Karberg & James, 2005). Those reporting use at the time of their offense engaged in treatment (7.5%) and other programs (15.7%) at higher rates. Conversely, nearly half of those inmate groups (46.9% and 52.1% comparatively) participated in substance abuse treatment under the conditions of correctional supervision (Karberg & James, 2005).

Cognitive-Behavior Therapy (CBT)

This type of therapy, which is usually incorporated into other treatment programs, focuses specifically on teaching coping and decision-making skills as well as other therapies to assist with behavioral changes and enhancement of motivation (Chandler et al., 2009). This type of psychotherapy assumes that individuals can become self-aware of their thoughts, feelings, and behaviors and, therefore, make positive changes to them (National Institute of Corrections, n.d.) and, as a result, is considered superlative rehabilitative treatment in regards to reducing recidivism. In correctional practices, there are generally three types of CBT programs that are utilized: Moral Reconciliation Therapy (MRT), Reasoning and Rehabilitation (R&R), and Thinking for a Change (T4C) (Lizama, Matthews, & Reyes, 2014). While each program focuses on slightly different skills, all have shown significant impacts on rates of re-arrest and prison admissions.

Moral Reconciliation Therapy (MRT)

MRT is based on the notion that offenders have a low moral reasoning level and, therefore, are unable to think and behave pro-socially. This program utilizes group and

workbook exercises to get offenders to confront their beliefs, attitudes, and behavior and improve their social, moral, behavioral, and cognitive deficits. If implemented correctly, MRT has been shown to reduce re-arrest rates of participants to 45% compared to 67% of the control group (Lizama, Matthews, & Reyes, 2014). Another meta-analysis of this specific type of program showed that MRT cut recidivism rates nearly in half of the expected outcome (Milkman & Wanberg, 2007).

Reasoning and Rehabilitation (R&R)

The R&R program is another form of CBT, but this one focuses on impulsive, narcissistic, non-sensical and/or rigid thinking. In this highly structured program, participants are in a classroom setting with only a small group. They utilize talk and play therapies through games, puzzles, audio-visual presentations, role-playing, and group discussions. The goal is to increase an offender's self-control and improve their interpersonal problem-solving skills and social perspective. Recidivism rates for this program were identified at 37% compared to 70% of non-participants, using prison readmissions as a measurement (Lizama, Matthews, & Reyes, 2014).

Thinking for a Change (T4C)

T4C, which was developed by the National Institute of Corrections, is most popular with most agencies utilizing EBPs. The focus of this program is two-fold: 1) to improve an offender's problem-solving skills, and 2) to respond to the feelings of others by addressing their cognitive, social, and emotional needs. This program also has significant impacts on recidivism rates and shows re-arrest rates for participants of 23% compared to 35% of non-participants measurement (Lizama, Matthews, & Reyes, 2014).

Vocation/Education

According to the Stephen (2008), only about 67% of institutions offer literacy training and lower basic adult education or access to secondary education or GED programming (77%). Moreover, only about 35% of institutions provide access to higher education. In contrast, only about 60.3% of local jails offer educational services to inmates. Of that, only 1 in 4 jails (24.7%) offer basic education programs, over half (54.8%) offer high school level classes, and only 3.4% offer any college courses. Further, only 6.5% of jails offer any type of vocational training. Further, only 52% of state prison inmates and 14% of jail inmates report engaging in education classes during their incarceration (Harlow, 2003). So, not only are inmates not enrolling in services offered, these services are non-existent in over one third of our country's jails. Given that education is clearly a tool to reduce recidivism and improve offender rehabilitation, this is an area that should be improved upon.

Conclusions

This information highlights that although several criminogenic needs have been identified, and correctional agencies are working to implement the strategies of EBPs into their policies and procedures for everyday supervision, the criminal justice system is neglecting a key factor in offender rehabilitation. Treatment programs in the jail are under utilized or just not available. Many of these programs have been empirically tested and shown to reduce offender recidivism, or improve offender success, but jails do not require participation and do not appear to have the resources available for offenders who want to participate. Agencies are using jail sanctions, with little evidence that they are effective at eliciting changed behaviors and are not incorporating key success factors into these periods of incarceration. Offender's lives are often

interrupted and thrown into chaos while incarcerated and they have little recourse to be productive or stay connected while in custody.

SECTION III: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Introduction

The following provides a review of the social bonding theory and how it relates to human behavior that is relevant to the ongoing discussion of offender rehabilitation. Provided is a general summary of the theory and how it can be applied to help improve offender success while still achieving the goals of the criminal justice system as it relates to reductions in recidivism rates and increased public safety. Additionally, an explanation of how incarceration is associated with or impacts these results is included.

Social Bonding Theory

In the 1960s, an American criminologist, Travis Hirschi, developed the social bonding theory, which is also sometimes referred to as the social control theory. Hirschi believed that individuals could be socialized by conventional means (i.e. schools, families, and communities) and less likely to engage in criminal activity. Plainly, he believed that socialization and the formation of personal relationships was one of the most significant aspects in human development. Further, he believed that these relationships would keep individuals from engaging in acts of social deviance or crime.

Hirschi's social bonding theory identified four elements that contributed to the social bond: 1) attachment; 2) commitment; 3) involvement; and 4) moral belief. The most important of these was attachment. Hirschi believed that the stronger the bonds between the individual and significant others (interpersonal relationships) was most important in deterring criminal behavior. These relationships allowed individuals to develop, learn and appreciate societal norms and cultural standards. These connections helped individuals to accept these standards into their individual identities and create an understanding of social boundaries, which keeps us from

focusing solely on ourselves and our own needs all of the time (Alston, Harley, & Lenhoff, 1995; Tibbetts & Hemmens, 2015).

However, Hirschi also believed that an individual must have a commitment to the community (something to lose if they are caught). While attachment is important, individuals must also have a commitment, or acceptance and willingness, to adhere to social expectations. Those that fail to develop attachment, and begin to feel as an outsider, will also see social expectations as less significant as well (Alston, Harley, & Lenhoff, 1995; Tibbetts & Hemmens, 2015).

The third element of this theory, involvement in conventional activities (like school or faith-based activities), also contributed to the concept of social bonding. Hirschi hypothesized that the more time that individuals spent participating in pro-social activities, the less time they would have to engage in deviant activities. He further contended that these pro-social activities provided a routine and fostered discipline which then encouraged a stronger determination to resist deviance (Alston, Harley, & Lenhoff, 1995; Tibbetts & Hemmens, 2015).

Lastly, an individual's moral belief contributed to their ability to remain in the community. Simply put, an individual must consider or believe that the societal rules are important, and violations of those rules is wrong (Alston, Harley, & Lenhoff, 1995; Schmellegger, 2017; Tibbetts & Hemmens, 2015). Hirschi believed those who questioned or challenged the societal norms had a greater inclination to behave in a deviant manner.

Hirschi concluded that the stronger those bonds with society and societal norms, the less likely the individual would be to commit crimes. However, as the elements of social control are weakened, the persons propensity for deviant behavior would increase. The idea behind this

concept is that all behavior is inherently “bad” and is controlled by society. Therefore, increasing the individual’s connections and investment in society increases the likelihood of “good” or “normal” behaviors (Schmallegger, 2017).

Application of Social Bonding Theory

What makes this theory important when considering jail sanctions is that incarceration takes offenders away from the societal bonds that are meant to keep them from engaging in deviant behaviors. When incarcerated, they have limited attachments to friends, family, or other supports they have developed and can no longer be involved in pro-social activities such as employment or faith-based activities. This removes two of the main elements that Hirschi considered essential in reducing criminal behaviors. Further, for those who have been in the criminal justice system for years, repetitive incarceration has reduced and even diminished their commitment to anything in society because they believe that they will lose it all for even the slightest infractions. This, then, removes another key component. So, agencies that routinely incarcerate offenders for technical infractions or on numerous occasions during a period of supervision, remove three out of the four components of social bonding.

Treatment is also underutilized or unavailable in local jails. This does not allow offenders the opportunity to address their criminal thinking patterns or their belief systems. With limited treatment, offenders are not able to engage in skill building and do not have the opportunity to be provided with information on societal norms or social expectations. Without this piece of the puzzle, offenders essentially lose all components of social control and likely to re-offend.

Correctional agencies must consider community-based options that achieve a level of punitive measures, but still allow the offender to engage in treatment and maintain the

connections or bonds that they have in the community. A good example of this can be seen in the successes found in problem-solving courts, like drug court. The most effective correctional program to reduce recidivism, to date, has been drug courts. Across the board, research has found that participants in drug courts have lower re-arrest rates, show lower drug use, and have less family conflict than those in traditional probation comparison groups (Walker, 2015). The key component in drug courts, and its primary mechanism to help to reduce recidivism and continued drug use, is the level of interaction, perception of and attitudes toward the judge. Participants who feel that the judge treats them fairly and respectfully, as well as shows a genuine interest in them as individuals, show better outcomes. Similarly, drug courts that provided participants with set consequences for failure of the program and gave a clear outline of sanctions that would be imposed for violations performed better. Additionally, the increased case management services, regular drug testing and at least 35 days of drug treatment also has shown to reduce drug use and criminal activity (Walker, 2015).

Conclusions

What can be gleaned from this is that removing an individual from the community and their support network, if positive and pro-social, can be detrimental to their success. Hirschi found that restoring individual's societal bonds and instilling a sort of belonging within the community reduce crime. Probation and parole have begun to incorporate EBPs to focus on reducing risk through treatment and supervision based on the outlined criminogenic need areas. However, much of their practices do not adequately address how incarceration, even for short periods of time, effect these bonds. Furthermore, nothing is being done to promote ongoing support of offenders to connect with these societal bonds while incarcerated.

SECTION IV: RECOMMENDATIONS

What this information demonstrates is that community corrections will likely continue the use of jail sanctions, as a needed tool of supervision to support public safety. However, it also points out that correctional agencies need to do more in order to increase the effectiveness of jails sanctions and decrease the disruptions to offender's lives. A primary option has been to incorporate the use of treatment and additional skill building, which helps to address the offender's criminogenic needs. Several different options can be utilized to increase an offender's ability to obtain or maintain stability within the community, such as employability workshops, educational services, substance abuse cognitive-behavioral treatment, or a combination of those. Further, providing an option for continuity of care into the community will add greater benefit to offenders as well.

As this paper discussed earlier, jail sanctions are heavily utilized in community corrections. However, little research is available to support the effectiveness of this type of sanction and, due to fears of continued mass incarceration, there is an increased need for criminal justice reform. Now is also a great time to do so, considering that many agencies have had to make significant changes to their operating policies due to the Coronavirus. Community corrections is having to think outside the box and develop more creative ways to respond to violations as many jails are limiting availability in order to reduce the spread of the virus, which has caused a global pandemic. Moreover, this has created an opportunity for research to determine if non-jail sanctions can show outcomes that produce lower recidivism rates. This would bolster the argument that jail sanctions are not needed as much in corrections today.

Based on the evidence presented in this paper, agencies would highly benefit from 1) increasing the availability and participation in both treatment programs; 2) increasing

engagement in services that promote social and life skills, including improving offender's educational levels, and strengthening employment skills; 3) implementing policies to require participation by inmates with set sentences, who likely will be incarcerated for six to twelve months; and 4) provide assistance in responsivity factors, such as housing, mental health, or transportation prior to and after release, which could also lead to greater reductions in recidivism as well because offenders would have less barriers to overcome upon release.

Adding an aftercare component (National Institute of Corrections, 2016) in addition to the in-custody treatment programs can increase the effect on outcomes. Much of the research done on treatment programs, show that their effectiveness is time-limited and, therefore, programs with a longer duration are usually more effective. Additionally, adding an aftercare component in the community has been shown to significantly improve the initial treatment program effectiveness. Therefore, the addition of an aftercare component should be considered as an essential principle to in-custody treatment to further increase the reductions in recidivism (Lizama, Matthews, & Reyes, 2014). A good example of this can be found in the Allegheny County Jail-Based Reentry Specialist Program. This program, which utilized a reentry probation officer and four reentry specialists, provided jail inmates with five or more months of treatment programming and services prior to their release. During the in-custody phase, participants were assigned to a reentry specialist and subjected to both EBPs as well as employment and education services, cognitive-based programming, and substance abuse prevention, as well as housing assistance and parenting groups. In-custody treatment was then followed by up to 12 months of supportive services in the community, post-release. In a 2014 evaluation, program participants had a re-arrest rate of 10%, compared to 34% for the comparison group (National Institute of Corrections, 2016).

These changes would also fall in line with the social bonding theory that to reduce crime, increase attachment, commitment, involvement, and belief in society. By increasing opportunities to engage in educational or employment programs, an individual can gain confidence in themselves and find a sense of belonging. They can begin to believe that they are worth something and that they can be a contributing part of the community. Through the development of community support systems, they can also increase their attachment to the outside which will increase their motivation to remain in the community. Further, cognitive-based treatments can help to change their moral beliefs systems, which can give them a changed perspective on a non-criminal lifestyle. This enables them to think about their situation differently and creates a greater fear of losing those attachments, which will inevitably lead to a change in behaviors.

SECTION V: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Incarceration rates in the United States are higher than any country in the world, and after someone serves his/her time, recidivism is likely to occur in within the first three years after release (Alper, Durose, & Markman, 2018). Correctional agencies are slowly moving towards better rehabilitation practices, but are leaving out a critical point of interest, the use of jail sanctions and lack of treatment provided during these short-term periods of incarceration. Evidence shows that jail sanctions alone are no better than community-based options and often are disruptive to an offender's long-term success. While these types of sanctions are necessary in corrections for public safety, they should be utilized far less than community-based options.

Research shows (Hall, 2015; Ramakers et al., 2017; Rothbard et al., 2009; SAMHSA/CSAT, 2005; Wooditch et al., 2014) that offender participation in employment and education services, substance abuse treatment and cognitive-behavioral treatment reduces their recidivism rates. Yet, local jails have limited availability and low participation rates. Further, the increased obstacles to implementing treatment within a jail setting are greater due to the shorter sentences and frequent turnover of offenders. However, increasing the availability and/or requirements of these programs and services, as well as adding an aftercare component in the community, would give offenders a greater likelihood of success when returning home. At the very least, it would provide offenders an opportunity to be productive while in custody instead of simply sitting and "doing their time."

Given the current state of corrections, now is the time to act. Agencies are already working to adjust policies and practices to accommodate for changes as a result of changes in the political climate as well as due to the recent health pandemic. This is a perfect opportunity to evaluate the use of EBPs and incorporate the use of treatment into jail sanctions or find

alternatives to jail sanctions all together. Agencies across the country need to look for new ways to lower incarceration rates as well as improve on ways to develop offender skills, which will give them a greater chance for success on their reentry journey.

REFERENCES

- Adams, K., Bennett, K.J., Flanagan, T.J., Marquart, J.W., Cuvelier, S.J., Fritsch, E., Gerber, J., Longmire, D.R., & Burton, V.S. (1994). A Large-Scale Multidimensional Test of the Effect of Prison Education Programs on Offenders' Behavior. *The Prison Journal*, 74(4). Retrieved from <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0032855594074004004>
- Apler, M., Durose, M.R., Markman, J. (2018). 2018 Update on Prisoner Recidivism: A 9-Year Follow-up Period (2005-2014). Bureau of Justice Statistics. Retrieved from <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/18upr9yfup0514.pdf>
- Alston, R. J., Harley, D., and Lenhoff, K. (1995). Hirschi's Social Control Theory: A Sociological Perspective on Drug Abuse Among Persons with Disabilities. *The Journal of Rehabilitation*. Retrieved from <https://people.uvawise.edu/pww8y/Supplement/-TheoristsSup/SocControlTh/HirSocConThHiBEnc.htm>
- Andrews, D. & Bonta J. (1998). *The psychology of criminal conduct*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson. Retrieved from https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=5MsRl66hAdAC&oi=fnd&pg=PP2&ots=uSH7cjjT_W&sig=CIpoLy65Jco8FDkzWz-Ncay-vUs#v=onepage&q&f=false
- Andrews, D.A. & Bonta, J. (2007). Risk-Need-Responsivity Model for Offender Assessment and Rehabilitation. Retrieved from <https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/rsrscs/pblctns/rsk-nd-rspnsvty/rsk-nd-rspnsvty-eng.pdf>

- Andrews, D. A., Bonta, J., & Wormith, J. S. (2011). The Risk-Need-Responsivity (RNR) Model: Does Adding the Good Lives Model Contribute to Effective Crime Prevention? *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 38(7), 735–755.
- Carson, E.A. (2020). Prisoners in 2018. U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Retrieved from <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/p18.pdf>
- Chandler, R.K., Fletcher, B.W. & Volkow, N.D. (2009). Treating Drug Abuse and Addiction in the Criminal Justice System: Improving Public Health and Safety. Retrieved from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2681083/>
- Cochran, J.C., Mears, D.P., and Bales, W.D. (2013). Assessing the effectiveness of correctional sanctions. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 30(2): 317-347. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43551992>
- Dirr, A. (2019). Broke in a Broken System: Probation holds clog Wisconsin jails; critics say the accused suffer without due process. *Milwaukee Journal Sentinel*. Retrieved from <https://www.jsonline.com/in-depth/news/local/milwaukee/2019/08/20/wisconsin-jails-probation-holds-seen-unfair-strain-defendants/1460376001/>
- Durose, M.R., Cooper, A.D., & Snyder H.N. (2014). Recidivism of Prisoners Released In 30 States In 2005: Patterns From 2005 To 2010 – Update. U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Retrieved from <https://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=4986>
- Good Lives Model. (n.d.) Information. Retrieved from <https://www.goodlivesmodel.com/information.shtml#General>

Guevara, M. and Solomon, E. (2009). Implementing evidence-based policy and practice in community corrections, 2nd ed. *Crime and Justice Institute*. Retrieved from https://www.cpoc.org/sites/main/files/file-attachments/community_corrections_boxset_oct09.pdf

Hall, L.L. (2015). Correctional Education and Recidivism: Toward a Tool for Reduction. *The Journal of Correctional Education*, 66(2). Retrieved from <https://web-b-ebSCOhost-com.ezproxy.uwplatt.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=1&sid=8258e208-464c-455c-a2e6-4cd9c37904bc%40pdc-v-sessmgr02>

Harlow, C. (2003). Education and Correctional Populations. Bureau of Justice Statistics. Retrieved from <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/ecp.pdf>

Judicial Review of Probation Conditions. (1967). *Columbia Law Review*, 67(1), 181-207. Retrieved from <https://www-jstor-org.ezproxy.uwplatt.edu/stable/pdf/1121134.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3A97aab8e36e95aefc810f0c0ee106060d>

Kaeble, D. (2018). Probation and Parole in the United States, 2016. U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Retrieved from <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/ppus16.pdf>

Karberg, J.C. & James, D.J. (2005). Substance Dependence, Abuse, and Treatment of Jail Inmates, 2002. U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Retrieved from <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/sdatji02.pdf>

- Kerbs, J.J., Jones, M. & Jolley, J.M. (2009). Discretionary Decision Making by Probation and Parole Officers: The Role of Extralegal Variables as Predictors of Responses to Technical Violations. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 25(4), 424-441. Retrieved from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.977.6589&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Linhorst, D., Dirks-Linhorst, P. A., & Groom, R. (2012). Rearrest and probation violation outcomes among probationers participating in a jail-based substance-abuse treatment used as an intermediate sanction. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 51(8), 519–540. Retrieved from <https://doi-org.ezproxy.uwplatt.edu/10.1080/10509674.2012.702713>
- Lizama, J., Matthews, V. and Reyes, S. (2014). What Works? Short-Term, In-Custody Treatment Programs. California State University, Center for Public Policy. Retrieved from <http://cpp.fullerton.edu/pdf/What%20Works.pdf>
- McLeod, S. (2018). Skinner – Operant conditioning. *Simply Psychology*. Retrieved from <https://www.simplypsychology.org/operant-conditioning.html>
- Michon, C. (2016). Uncovering Mass Incarceration’s Literacy Disparity. Prison Policy Initiative. Retrieved from <https://www.prisonpolicy.org/blog/2016/04/01/literacy/>
- Milkman, H. and Wanberg, K. (2007). Cognitive-Behavioral Treatment: A Review and Discussion for Corrections Professionals. Retrieved from <https://info.nicic.gov/nicrp/system/files/021657.pdf>
- National Institute of Corrections. (n.d.) Evidence-based Practices (EBPs). Retrieved from <https://nicic.gov/evidence-based-practices-ebp>

- National Institute of Justice. (2013). Research on Reentry and Employment. Retrieved from <https://www.nij.gov/topics/corrections/reentry/pages/employment.aspx>
- National Institute of Justice. (2016). Program Profile: Allegheny County (Penn.) Jail-Based Reentry Specialist Program. Retrieved from <https://www.crimesolutions.gov/ProgramDetails.aspx?ID=494>
- Pager, D., Western, B. & Sugie, N. (2009). Sequencing Disadvantage: Barriers to Employment Facing Young Black and White Men with Criminal Records. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/228584.pdf>
- Phelps M. S. (2013). The paradox of probation: Community supervision in the age of mass incarceration. *Law & Policy*, 35(1-2), 51–80. Retrieved from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3780417/>
- Potter, T.L. (2001). Rehabilitation treatment needs for inmates of county jails. Retrieved from <https://minds.wisconsin.edu/handle/1793/40131>
- Ramakers, A., Nieuwebeerta, P., Van Wilsem, J., & Dirkzwager, A. (2017). Not Just Any Job Will Do: A Study on Employment Characteristics and Recidivism Risks After Release. *International journal of offender therapy and comparative criminology*, 61(16), 1795–1818. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X16636141>
- Rothbard, A. B., Wald, H., Zubritsky, C., Jaquette, N., and Chhatre, S. (2009). Effectiveness of a jail-based treatment program for individuals with co-occurring disorders. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 27(4), 643–654. Retrieved from <https://doi-org.ezproxy.uwplatt.edu/10.1002/bsl.882>

Sawyer, W. and Wagner, P. (2020). Mass Incarceration: The Whole Pie 2020. Prison Policy Initiative. Retrieved from <https://www.prisonpolicy.org/reports/pie2020.html>

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) and Center for Substance Abuse Treatment (CSAT). (2005). Substance Abuse Treatment for Adults in the Criminal Justice System: 8 Treatment Issues Specific to Jails. *Treatment Improvement Protocol (TIP) Series, 44*. Retrieved from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK64145/>

Schmallegger, F., (2017). Criminal Justice Today: An Introductory Text for the 21st Century, 14th Ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pearson Education, Inc.

The Council of State Governments (CSG) Justice Center. (2017). Confined and costly: How supervision violations are filling prisons and burdening budgets. Retrieved from <https://csgjusticecenter.org/confinedandcostly/>

Tibbetts, S.G. & Hemmens, C. (2015). Criminological Theory: A Text Reader. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Vallas, R. & Dietrich, S. (2014). One Strike and You're Out: How We Can Eliminate Barriers to Economic Security and Mobility for People with Criminal Records. Center for American Progress. Retrieved from <https://cdn.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/VallasCriminalRecordsReport.pdf>

Walker, S. (2015). Sense and Nonsense About Crime, Drugs, and Communities, 8th ed. Stamford, CT: Cengage Learning.

Warren, R.K. (2007). Evidence based practice to reduce recidivism: Implications for state judiciaries. *Crime and Justice Institute*. Retrieved from <https://www.ncsc.org/~media/Microsites/Files/CSI/Reduce-Recidivism.ashx>

Williams, J., Schiraldi, V., and Bradner, K. (2019). The Wisconsin community corrections story. *Columbia University Justice Lab*. Retrieved from <https://justicelab.columbia.edu/sites/default/files/content/Wisconsin%20Community%20Corrections%20Story%20final%20online%20copy.pdf>

Wodahl, E.J., Boman IV, J.H., and Garland, B.E. (2015). Responding to probation and parole violations: Are jail sanctions more effective than community-based graduated sanctions? *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 43: 242-250.

Wooditch, A., Tang, L. L., and Taxman, F. S. (2014). Which criminogenic need changes are most important in promoting desistance from crime and substance use? *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 41(3), 276–299. Retrieved from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4045616/>

Zeng, Z. (2020). Jail Inmates in 2018. U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Retrieved from <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/ji18.pdf>