

Exploring the Perceptions of the Offender-Officer Relationship in a Community Supervision Setting

Ryan M. Labrecque, M.S.

Myrinda Schweitzer, M.A.

Paula Smith, Ph.D.

University of Cincinnati

Community Supervision

- Widely used sanction in CJ
- “Traditional” supervision underscores:
 - Monitoring compliance
 - Making referrals
- These services may perform less than optimally in reducing recidivism

(Bonta et al., 2008; Solomon et al., 2005)

The Principles of Effective Intervention

- Effective program characteristics
 - RNR
 - Based on behavioral approaches
 - Use cognitive strategies
 - Occur in the natural environment
 - Be multimodal and intensive

(Andrews & Bonta, 2010; Gendreau, 1996)

RNR Model

- Risk Principle
 - Treat “high-risk” offenders
- Need Principle
 - Target “criminogenic” needs
- Responsivity Principle
 - Match strategies to the learning style and motivation of offenders

RNR Approaches to Supervision

- Integrate RNR into community supervision
- Teach officers how to structure face-to-face interactions with offenders
- Preliminary results from several jurisdictions have been associated with meaningful reductions in recidivism

Chris Trotter

- Offenders supervised by trained officers recidivated at a lower rate (54%), compared to those supervised by untrained officers (64%)

(Trotter, 1996, 2006)

Strategic Training Initiative in Community Supervision (STICS)

- Offenders supervised by trained officers recidivated at a lower rate (25%), compared to those supervised by untrained officers (40%)

(Bonta et al., 2010)

Staff Training Aimed at Reducing Re-arrest (STARR)

- Offenders supervised by trained officers recidivated at a lower rate (26%), compared to those supervised by untrained officers (34%)

(Robinson et al., 2011)

Effective Practices in Community Supervision (EPICS)

- Adds the components of:
 - Role clarification
 - Relapse prevention
 - Structured skill building
- Preliminary results suggest trained officers demonstrate a more consistent use of RNR

(Smith et al., in press)

The Offender-Officer Relationship

- “Firm-but-fair” approach
- Relationships should possess the characteristics of
 - Openness
 - Warmness
 - Enthusiastic communication

(Andrews & Kiessling, 1980)

Measuring the Offender-Officer Relationship

- Working Alliance Inventory (WAI)
(Horvath & Greenberg, 1986)
 - Dual-Role Relationship Inventory (DRI-R)
 - Caring/Fairness
 - Trust
 - Toughness
 - Toughness correlated with the overall number of recent violations ($r = .34, p < .001$)
- (Skeem et al., 2007)

Supervisory Style

- Parolees assigned to officers with:
 - Law enforcement “punitive” orientation
 - 43% arrested for technical violations
 - 16% convicted of new offense
 - Balanced approach “care and control”
 - 13% arrested for technical violations
 - 6% convicted of new offense

(Paparozzi & Gendreau, 2005)

Current Study

- 2009 EPICS pilot study
- Three parole regions
- Random assignment
- Ongoing study

PO Questionnaire

- A version of the DRI-R
- Overall score
 - Three subscales:
 - Caring/fairness
 - Trust
 - Toughness

EPICS Score

- EPICS coders rated each audiotape (33 items)
- To calculate a composite EPICS score
 - 1 = had the opportunity, but did not use skill
 - 0 = no opportunity to use the skill
 - 1 = used skill, but missed some steps
 - 2 = proficient use of the skill

Descriptive Statistics of the Sample

	Trained		Untrained	
	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>
Officers		<i>N</i> = 12		<i>N</i> = 7
Male	50.0	6	57.1	4
White	91.7	11	85.7	6
Offenders		<i>N</i> = 70		<i>N</i> = 35
Male*	88.6	62	74.3	26
White	61.4	43	68.6	24
Moderate Risk	92.9	65	97.1	34
Mean Age (SD)	34.1	10.4	36.2	12.7

* $p < .10$

EPICS Training on Offender Perception of Relationship

	Trained		Untrained		<i>r</i> [95% CI]
	M	SD	M	SD	
	<i>N</i> = 76		<i>N</i> = 45		
PO Questionnaire	172.7	23.7	173.4	22.3	-.02 [-.20, .16]
Fair/Care	120.9	18.0	117.7	19.5	.08 [-.10, .26]
Trust*	30.0	5.0	32.5	3.6	-.26 [-.41, -.08]
Tough	10.3	5.9	8.7	5.2	.13 [-.05, .30]

**p* < .01

EPICS Training on Officer Use of RNR Skills

	Trained		Untrained		<i>r</i> [95% CI]
	M	SD	M	SD	
	<i>N</i> = 12		<i>N</i> = 7		
EPICS Score	4.9	4.5	1.6	3.7	.37 [-.10, .71]

Officer Use of EPICS on Offender Perception of Relationship

	<i>r</i> [95% CI]
PO Questionnaire*	.16 [-.02, .32]
Fair/Care	.12 [-.06, .29]
Trust	.14 [-.04, .31]
Tough*	-.16 [-.33, .02]

* $p < .10$

EPICS Performance and PO Questionnaire Scores

EPICS Score	PO Questionnaire Score	
	Below Average	Above Average
	% (<i>n</i>)	% (<i>n</i>)
Below Average	58.5 (38)	41.5 (27)
Above Average	41.1 (23)	58.9 (33)

$\phi = .17, p < .10$

Offender Race on Offender Perception of Relationship

	White		Nonwhite		<i>r</i> [95% CI]
	M	SD	M	SD	
	<i>N</i> = 76		<i>N</i> = 45		
PO Questionnaire^{***}	179.5	19.3	161.9	24.9	.37 [.21, .51]
Fair/Care^{***}	124.7	16.0	111.4	19.7	.35 [.18, .50]
Trust^{**}	31.7	4.0	29.6	5.4	.23 [.05, .39]
Tough[*]	8.9	4.8	11.1	6.8	-.19 [-.36, -.01]

p* < .10, *p* < .05, ****p* < .001

Conclusion

- Training alone may not impact the quality of the offender-officer relationship
- Training may impact officer use of RNR skills
- Officer use of RNR may influence the quality of the offender-officer relationship
- Race and risk may influence offender perceptions of offender-officer relationship

Contact Information

Ryan Labrecque

Research Associate, Corrections Institute

Graduate Student, School of Criminal Justice

University of Cincinnati

P.O. Box 210389

Cincinnati, OH 45221-0389

E-mail: ryan.labrecque@uc.edu