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1. INTRODUCTION
Parole reform in California

The California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) Division of Adult Parole Operations (DAPO) currently supervises approximately 125,000 offenders on post-release supervision, or parole. California's rate of parolees per population, currently 438 per 100,000 residents, is much higher than the national average of 315 (Glaze & Bonczar, 2009). This is due in part to the large prison population in California, which results in a large number of offenders released to community supervision at the completion of their sentences. Two sentencing decisions contribute to California's higher-than-average number of parolees. First, determinate sentencing laws introduced in 1976 resulted in fixed sentences of imprisonment for particular crimes, followed by mandatory release. This compares with a system of indeterminate sentencing, applied in some states, which sets minimum and maximum terms but leaves the release decision to parole boards (discretionary release). Second, California historically has released all prisoners to a period of supervised parole, usually for three years, rather than reserving supervision for some offenders and releasing offenders assessed to be a lower risk to the community with no supervision requirements. With so many offenders under parole supervision, inevitably many parolees violate parole, either by committing a new offense or through technical violations of their parole conditions (e.g., failing a drug test or missing a meeting with their parole agent). The return to custody (RTC) rate for a parolee in California is 66%, nearly twice the national average (Fischer, 2005), and on any given day, six out of ten prison admissions in California are returning parolees (Grattet, Petersilia, & Lin, 2008).

In recent years, reviews of the corrections system in California have recommended reforms to implement evidence-based practices (EBP) into corrections policy. One common suggestion has been the targeting of parole supervision and treatment resources to those offenders at most risk of reoffending (Little Hoover Commission, 2007; Burke, 2009). Two recent legislative changes have altered California’s parole system significantly. First, Senate Bill 3X 18 (Penal Code Section 3000.03), effective January 25th 2010, introduced Non-Revocable Parole (NRP), which placed ‘lower risk, low stakes’ offenders into the community with no parole supervision or parole conditions, but still subject to warrantless search and seizure by law enforcement. To be eligible for NRP, offenders must have no prior serious or violent felonies, a low or moderate California Static Risk Assessment (CSRA) risk score, and not be required to register as a sex offender. Consequently, parole resources were targeted toward those offenders with a higher risk to reoffend who were most in need of assistance with reentry. Second, legislation changed the funding of agent caseloads, reducing caseloads from a funding ratio of 70 cases per agent down to 48:1. These two changes - the removal of a proportion of offenders from parole caseloads and the potential to lower the number of cases that each agent supervised - resulted in a unique opportunity for DAPO management to reconsider the way it supervised offenders to incorporate recent developments in EBP research and ‘best practice’ policies being introduced by colleague agencies elsewhere.

In October 2009, DAPO convened a Parole Reform Task Force (PRTF) to recommend new policies and procedures in light of research findings and supervision methods used in other jurisdictions. The PRTF comprised 19 representatives from DAPO Headquarters and all four parole regions, and included ranks of Parole Agent 1 (‘rank and file’ parole agents), PA2 (Assistant Unit Supervisors), and PA3 (Unit Supervisors), in addition to Parole Administrators, Deputy Regional Administrators, and Regional Administrators. The Task Force met weekly through January 2010 and produced a report describing the new parole model, called the California Parole Supervision and Reintegration Model (CPSRM).

The CPSRM represented a significant change to the way DAPO supervised offenders post-release. Sections in the Task Force report (i.e., pre-release planning, case management, case conferences, quality of supervision, agent workload, programming, parolee rewards and incentives, and parolee discharge procedures) carefully documented relevant research findings in support of the new practices outlined. At the crux of CPSRM was a move away from a ‘surveillance’ model of supervision towards an approach that emphasized both the quality of supervision, and the engagement of the parolee in the supervision process. Agents were trained in Motivational Interviewing (MI) techniques and used detailed comprehensive interviews to identify the criminogenic needs of parolees. These criminogenic needs formed the basis of the parolee’s case plan. Parolees were encouraged to identify tangible, small steps they could take every month in order to address these needs, and these tasks were written down in a Goals Report. Parolees were now invited to attend Case Conference Reviews in which their case plan was discussed; early discharge from parole was based on the level of commitment shown by the parolee in taking a more active role in his/her supervision.

Based on the PRTF report a comprehensive DAPO policy manual was developed. Current plans are that CPSRM will roll out state-wide. Prior to its widespread implementation, a pilot implementation took place at four parole units in order to test policies in the field and make adjustments based on agent feedback. This report presents findings from surveys of parole agent attitudes during the CPSRM pilot implementation process.
The CPSRM pilot

Selection of pilot sites

Four parole units from across California – one in each of DAPO’s four parole regions – were selected as pilot sites to implement CPSRM prior to its widespread introduction. The pilot units were Bakersfield 7 in Region I (BAK7), Santa Rosa 2 in Region II (SR2), San Gabriel Valley 1 in Region III (SGV1), and Tricity in Region IV. Pilot units were selected on the basis of having Unit Supervisors or Parole Administrators who served on the PRTF. Consequently, the leadership of these units had input into the reform process and extensive knowledge of parole reform, which provided a logical place to begin implementation.

Pilot site training

The pilot implementation was divided into three distinct Phases, each spaced approximately two months apart. Each Phase included separate elements of the reform package. Agent training was provided prior to each Phase; this gave agents information and practice in the policies about to be introduced without over-loading them with the entire reform package all at once. Training was conducted as a group, with staff from all four pilot units traveling to a central location at the start of each Phase for training.

Training in CPSRM Phase 1 took place at Region IV Headquarters, Diamond Bar, on July 14th and 15th, 2010. This initial two-day training session covered Phase 1 of the implementation, and included introductory material on EBP, systemic changes introduced in the new model, the pilot plan, as well as detailed information on the first three components of CPSRM, namely (1) agent workload, (2) supervision model and quality of contacts, and (3) case conferences.

Phase 2 training was conducted on October 6th and 7th, 2010, and covered two CPSRM components, namely pre-release planning and case management. Phase 3 training covered the remaining two components (rewards and incentives and discharge consideration) and took place on January 11th and 12th, 2011.

Pilot site implementation

The pilot officially commenced two weeks after Phase 1 training, with the pilot units switching to the CPSRM model of supervision on August 1st, 2010. Significant changes introduced by the pilot included a reduction in caseload sizes (down to 48 cases per agent), the reclassification of parolees into new supervision categories based on CSRA score, and new paperwork and procedures such as the Comprehensive Interview, Monthly Goals Report, Case Conference Reviews, and residence verification.

2. CEBC EVALUATION

The Center for Evidence-Based Corrections (CEBC) has been tasked by the CDCR Office of Research to evaluate parole reform through two evaluations – a process evaluation, and outcome evaluation.

Process evaluation

The process evaluation will examine the implementation of CPSRM at the pilot units, and look at issues such as the development of policy and training materials, agent perceptions of training, the effectiveness of the implementation of individual CPSRM components, and changes in parole agent attitudes, knowledge and behavior. This evaluation will use pre- and post-survey measures, as well as interviews, document analysis, and an observational behavioral study that will measure speech patterns during agent-parolee interactions both pre- and post-parole reform. We will publish results of the completed process evaluation in a final report, once post-reform measures have been completed. We will also produce progress reports during the pilot implementation to disseminate findings arising from the various research methodologies when research components are completed. This report is one such progress report, intended to provide DAPO and CDCR management with timely information relating to the implementation process.

Outcome evaluation

The second evaluation will focus on outcomes, and will comprise a recidivism analysis to evaluate the effect of CPSRM on parolee recidivism behavior and, in turn, public safety. This evaluation will compare rates of recidivism for parolees supervised under the new model at the pilot sites with two control groups (1) parolees under regular supervision at four non-pilot parole units selected by Regional Administrators on the basis of demography and caseloads as comparable to the pilot units, and (2) parolees who were supervised at the pilot sites in 2008 prior to the introduction of CPSRM (note that this historical control group was screened and NRP-eligible parolees were removed from the sample). The outcome evaluation will analyze recidivism data for 12 months following CPSRM introduction, commencing August 1st 2010.
The aim of this report

The focus of this document is to report the findings from the surveys of pilot site agent attitudes toward rehabilitation and their role that were collected at two different points in time. We administered baseline surveys during Phase 1 training prior to the CPSRM pilot implementation to establish an initial measure of agent attitudes (a) toward rehabilitation in general, and (b) toward the rehabilitative functions of their role. Results will provide an indication of how receptive agents at the pilot sites were to parole reform.

We readministered the same surveys during Phase 3 training in January 2011, approximately five months after the implementation of parole reform, to assess change in agent attitudes over time. Parole reform introduced a slight shift in organizational philosophy away from a ‘law enforcement’ approach to supervision and toward a ‘social worker’ approach, with reduced case-load sizes and a greater emphasis on understanding and addressing the risk factors that contribute to offending behavior. The pre-post-design of the survey research tested whether CPSRM was associated with a change in parole agent attitude toward the value of rehabilitation or perception of the parole agent role.

While the discussion about agent attitudes is the main focus of this report we also report findings from a knowledge survey developed by the DAPO Training Academy that measured knowledge of the CPSRM components covered during Phase 1 training.

The next section covers a review of the literature on attitudes of community supervision personnel, before turning our attention to the current research on page 7.

3. PREVIOUS RESEARCH ON PAROLE AGENT ATTITUDES

The first thing one notices when conducting a review of the literature published in this area is the over-representation of studies examining correctional officers within an adult institution setting. A cursory search found studies covering prison officer attitudes toward rehabilitation and treatment, inmates, drugs, carrying of weapons, religion, education, AIDS, homosexuality, sexual assault, self harm, personality disorder, and punishment. Particular attention has been given in the literature to prison officer role orientation, and how role conflict may contribute to burnout and work stress. Since there is some suggestion that the tools developed to measure the attitudes of prison officers may not translate well to a community supervision setting, we have limited the scope of our literature review to probation and parole.

Early community supervision studies that ‘catalogued’ attitudes

Early research in this field was aimed at developing measures to classify parole and probation staff according to their attitudinal style. For example, Ohlin, Piven & Pappenfort (1956) developed the probation and parole officer attitude profile, which classified officers into the three categories of ‘punitive officer’, ‘protective agent’ or ‘welfare worker’. This scheme was based on the competing roles of control and assistance. This early measure was refined by Glaser (1969), who developed scenarios that called for either a treatment or control response and asked officers to state his or her likely response. The two underlying opposing dimensions of control and treatment were divided into four ‘types’ of supervision officers – punitive, paternal, passive and welfare.

This early research in instrument development provided a basis for comparing attitudes over time. In the 1980’s, for instance, research using updated versions of these measures found that concern for authority among probation officers increased significantly over time (Harris, Clear & Baird, 1989). Compared with two decades earlier, authority became a more important concept in supervision that did either assistance or treatment. The authors suggested several possible explanations for this change in attitude, including an increase over time in the proportion of felons under community supervision as a result of prison crowding, a general shift in public confidence in the value of rehabilitation and treatment, or a general shift toward conservatism in corrections.

The research on changing attitudes over time highlights the three separate ‘periods’ in community supervision reported in the literature (see for example Taxman, 2008). Prior to 1970, a social work model prevailed. The publication of Martinson’s (1974) paper represented the onset of a ‘nothing works’ era, emphasizing the enforcement of conditions of supervision, which persisted until the early 1990s. At this point there was a growing realization that supervision needs to be combined with treatment to be successful, and research became focused on identifying ‘what works’. Out of this research evolved the concept of EBP, and approaches such as Risk-Needs-Responsivity (RNR).

In addition to the study of large secular changes, a number of research studies have examined the attitudes of community supervision personnel during the implementation and evaluation of a particular evidence-based supervision practice. For example, one study compared the attitudes of probation and parole officers using regular supervision with those using a recently introduced Intensive Supervision Program (ISP) for high risk offenders (Fulton, Stichman, Travis & Latessa, 1997). ISP officers received intensive training in ‘effective intervention’. The attitudinal survey consisted of 33 semantic differentials that measured officer attitudes towards their role and functions. The authors found differences in the attitudes of ISP and

1 Note that a scale from this survey instrument was used for the present research.
regular supervision officers, and these differences were not related to the location of the agency (two sites were studied), officer’s gender, age, or years as a probation/parole officer. Specifically, ISP officers showed a much stronger focus on the rehabilitative functions of probation and parole and the importance of treatment and services. However, there were two limitations to this study. First, the sample size was small, with only 11 officers in the ISP sample. Secondly, there was no pre-test (baseline) measure of attitudes prior to the introduction of the ISP. Therefore, the observed differences in attitude could be due to particular types of officers with these sorts of attitudes being drawn to ISP, or it could be that ISP officers, due to their training and the environment in which they work, select responses they believe to be more ‘desirable’ (i.e. rehabilitative).

A study by Schlager (2008) surveyed parole staff in a Northeastern state on two occasions, six months apart, to coincide with the introduction of an EBP program that was designed to shift orientation from surveillance to one that balanced treatment and supervision. Officers were asked to report their attitudes on a variety of topics including treatment and referral practices, crime reduction, programming, and other agency-specific issues. This study reported that, during baseline, staff was ‘sanction heavy’ when it came to technical parole violations, although overall they were supportive of treatment. However, over time no significant differences in the majority of the attitudes measured were found. The authors concluded that the lack of attitudinal change was a result of EBP not being implemented successfully by the parole agency. It was observed that significant attention was diverted to talking about EBP and selling the policy to staff, as opposed to implementing it into policy and practice.

Instead of merely cataloguing types of attitudes, some research has examined what community corrections personnel actually do on the job, and has attempted to classify personal style of supervision according to the nature of the tasks performed. Seiter & West (2003) addressed the issue of what probation and parole officers do when supervising offenders; they identified and quantified styles of casework and surveillance supervision. They also examined what factors (e.g., agency policy, supervisors) influenced supervision style. In order to create an instrument to identify style of supervision, officers at a probation/parole district in Missouri were asked to list supervision activities. The 15 nominated activities were classified as either casework or surveillance by a group of experts. Officers were then surveyed to ascertain the amount of supervision time allocated to performing each task. Three tasks (counseling, writing violation reports, and conducting assessments) accounted for 41% of the total amount of time officers spent on supervision activities. Looking at all officers, 56% of the time was spent on casework and 41% on surveillance activities (the total does not add to 100% due to the inclusion of ‘other’ tasks). In addition, officers were asked to rate their supervision style, as well as that of their peers, on a 10 point scale ranging from ‘casework’ (at one end) to ‘surveillance’ (at the other). A score of 5.5 would reflect a balanced approach, and the mean reported in this study did reflect a balanced supervisory style both for self and peer ratings. Officers who rated themselves as more surveillance-oriented also reported that they spent more time on surveillance tasks, suggesting that one's style has a direct impact on one's activities. A weakness of this study, however, is that evidence suggests that there is not a strong relationship between what people report they do, and what they actually do, due to deficiencies in self-report measures of behavior.

Another method used for examining the tasks of community supervision personnel is to analyze state statutes that govern parole or probation functions. For example, Purkiss, Kifer, Hemmens and Burton (2003) looked at the statutory functions of probation officers across the United States in 2002 and found there were 23 legislatively prescribed duties. Of these, 18 were law enforcement functions (e.g., supervision, surveillance, and arrest) and 5 were rehabilitative functions (e.g., assist in rehabilitation and counsel). The six tasks most prescribed by states were all law enforcement oriented, and included supervision, investigation of cases, record keeping, surveillance, the development of probation conditions, and arrest. A comparison of statutes from 1992 to 2002 showed that, of the five tasks classified as rehabilitative, three of them increased in prevalence across the country, providing evidence that although the legally prescribed functions of probation officers were overwhelmingly law enforcement oriented, they were becoming more balanced over time. It is interesting to note that many states prescribed fewer than five of the overall 23 tasks; California had six. With few functions mandated, officers may have considerable discretion when carrying out their role.

One final study worth mentioning asked state and federal community corrections officers to describe their personal style (Gunnison & Helfgott, 2007). Qualitative responses were coded into three categories: professional (described as being firm, fair and consistent), restorative (officers who individualized their approach to meet the holistic needs of offenders), and surveillance (which emphasized enforcement of the law and surveillance activities). Those classified as professional accounted for 54% of officers, with 35% describing themselves as restorative and the remaining 11% as surveillance. Interestingly, officers with different styles of supervision reported different attitudes towards offenders. For example, ‘surveillance’ officers were more likely to report that offenders were born evil, and relied on officers too much to fix their problems. These officers were more negative about the relationship between officers and offenders, maintaining a level of social distance in the relationship that could be perceived as an unwillingness to help or understand the situation. Female officers rated a higher number of needs and challenges as important and held other beliefs about offenders that suggested that females may see themselves as playing a stronger rehabilitative role than males. Older, more experienced officers were more comfortable in their roles and less inclined to maintain a high social distance with offenders. These attitudinal differences led the authors to conclude that offenders may receive different levels of support depending on the officer’s background and personal style.
Research linking attitudes with correctional practice

Very few studies have attempted to directly link attitudes of community corrections agents with their behavior on the job, in order to directly examine the questions of whether attitudes are indicative of particular practices. Clear and O’Leary (1983) found that attitudes of authority and assistance were related to the type and number of supervision objectives that officers set for clients. Katz (1982) similarly found a relationship between attitudes and an officer’s decision to revoke. Dembo (1972) found that officers reporting a low ‘reintegrative’ score (meaning they had a greater punishment orientation) were more likely to take a formal action on violations and recommend a return to prison. Therefore, there is some evidence that officer orientations can influence case outcomes.

A study by Clear and Latessa (1993) examined the relationship between attitude and performance by comparing two groups of probation officers – officers from a ‘get tough’ ISP program (that emphasized a control orientation) in Georgia and an ISP in Ohio (that emphasized a treatment philosophy). This study measured attitudes using the authority/assistance questionnaire (Clear, 1978). Probation officers were then presented with five hypothetical cases developed from parole files, and asked to rate the importance of 60 supervision tasks. Tasks had been generated by focus groups and classified by the authors as either control tasks (e.g., have client come in every morning, impose jail time), or support tasks (e.g., counsel offender to recognize own problems, talk personally to family). The authors found that both attitudes and organizational philosophy were related to control tasks. That is, officers from the ‘get tough’ site as well as officers with an authoritative attitude rated control tasks more highly. However, when it came to support tasks, only the site had a significant influence; an organizational philosophy favoring treatment seems to be more important in producing support tasks than an individual’s personal preference. Two main conclusions can be drawn from this study. First, while officers were found to exhibit role preferences, they were able to perform tasks of both assistance and control. Second, “a forceful organizational policy on treatment apparently can lead to staff actions which advance that philosophy” (p. 457).

Further research is needed in this area, as insufficient attention has been given to identifying how parole and probation personnel perform on the job and how performance is influenced by factors such as attitude, experience, or organizational climate.

Research linking attitudes to recidivism outcomes

Little research has examined the relationship between agent attitudes and offender outcomes, probably due to the methodological constraints inherent in such research. Although there is scant empirical evidence, a link between agent attitudes and parolee or probationer outcomes has often been suggested. One study (Paparozzi & Gendreau, 2005) classified parole officers as either ‘law enforcement’, ‘balanced’, or ‘casework’ in their approach using The Parole Officer Punishment and Reintegrative Orientation Questionnaire (Dembo, 1972). This questionnaire includes 24 items rated on a continuum from one (punishment orientation) to seven (social casework orientation), with the overall score indicating an approach to supervision that was law enforcement in its orientation, balanced (a blend of law enforcement and social casework), or social casework in its approach. The authors compared rates of recidivism (technical parole violations, new convictions, and revocations) for parolees (N=240) supervised under ISP and those (N=240) receiving traditional supervision. A balanced orientation to supervision resulted in significantly fewer new convictions and revocations for technical violations. A law enforcement orientation to supervision resulted in significantly more technical violations, but fewer new arrests. Conversely, a social work approach was related to an increase in new arrests but fewer technical violations. This pattern of results led the authors to conclude that a ‘get tough’ approach may lead to more technical violations being acted upon rather than overlooked. Conversely, an excessively forgiving, non directive approach may in fact reinforce criminal behavior by letting offenders get away with things that they perhaps shouldn’t; a ‘firm but fair’ balanced approach was more helpful.

Research on effective supervisory behavior

This section will discuss in more detail research that has attempted to determine effective supervisory strategies by looking at the relationship between an agent’s supervisory behavior (instead of attitudes) and parolee outcomes. This research usually involves the evaluation of a change to supervision policy, often introduced under the auspices of EBP.

Several published studies have evaluated Maryland’s Proactive Community Supervision (PCS) for parole and probation (Sachwald, Eley, & Taxman, 2006; Taxman, 2007, 2008). The program (similar to California’s new parole model) focused on identifying offenders’ criminogenic needs, engaging the offender in a behavioral contract designed to address these needs, and setting realistic behavioral goals that represented small steps for offenders to achieve. Supervision contacts were based on better understanding offenders and what drives their criminal activity. Agents under this supervision model were seen as behavioral managers, trained extensively in MI, case planning, and problem-solving skills, with the goal of re-shaping contacts to address problem behaviors. The one-year rearrest rate for offenders under PCS was 32%, compared with 42% for those under traditional supervision (Taxman, 2008). In addition, those supervised under PCS had a 34.7% technical violation rate, compared with 40.1% supervised under the traditional model, even though we might expect higher rates under PCS because of the more frequent contact with the offender.
Promising research evaluating the influence of supervision on offender outcomes has been carried out by James Bonta and his colleagues at Public Safety Canada. An initial meta-analysis of studies looking at the influence of community supervision on recidivism uncovered 15 papers published between 1980 and 2006. Small effect sizes were found, and the authors concluded that “on the whole, community supervision does not appear to work very well” (Bonta, Rugge, Scott, Bourgon & Yessine, 2008 p. 251). However, the review found that when principles of RNR were met, it was possible to achieve reductions in recidivism of up to 50% (Andrews & Bonta, 2006). Their first empirical study obtained audio recordings from 62 probation officers during their daily interactions with probationers, submitted at three different points in time. Overall, 154 tapes were analyzed. Trained coders listened for at least two examples of statements about criminogenic needs in each five-minute segment. Tapes were also coded for the overall quality of the relationship between probationer and officer (i.e. empathy, openness, warmth, firmness, encouragement, enthusiasm and humor), as well as ratings of the officer’s use of behavioral techniques (i.e. modeling appropriate behavior, behavioral practice, reinforcing prosocial activity, discouraging antisocial behaviors, relapse prevention, homework assignment). Recidivism was measured using new convictions, and the average follow-up period was 3.3 years. Officers typically demonstrated a low base rate of the behavioral intervention techniques, and these techniques were not related to recidivism. Officers also showed only a moderate adherence to RNR principles generally. However, the amount of time devoted to dealing with criminogenic needs was a strong predictor of recidivism – the more time, the lower the rate of recidivism. For example, when officers spent more than 40 minutes on criminogenic needs, only 3% of offenders recidivated, compared with a rate of 49% when the time spent totaled 0-19 minutes (and 36% recidivism when the time totaled 20 – 39 minutes). This study also found that it was better not to cover a range of topics. After adjusting for risk, the more time spent on the conditions of probation, the higher the recidivism rate. But when officers spent time on needs this was shown to improve outcomes for offenders.

Bonta’s most recent work (Bonta, Bourgon, Rugge, Scott, Yessine, Gutierrez, & Li, 2010) sought to assess the impact on recidivism of officer training in RNR. The training program, termed the Strategic Training Initiative in Community Supervision (STICS), consisted of three days of training followed by ongoing skill maintenance. Fifty two probation officers were randomly assigned either to STICS (N=33) or a no training control group (N=19). Again, audio tapes of client interactions were collected by officers and submitted to researchers for analysis. Each tape was given quality scores (e.g., structuring skills, relationship building, behavioral techniques, cognitive techniques, correctional skills), and statements concerning criminogenic needs during each five-minute interval were counted (as well as the proportion of the session spent discussing criminogenic needs). Officers who underwent STICS training behaved differently; they spent proportionally more of their supervision sessions discussing criminogenic needs, with fewer discussions of noncriminogenic needs or conditions of probation. STICS officers discussed procriminal attitudes approximately six times more frequently than did non-STICS officers (39.1% compared with 6.7%). Officers who received STICS training also received higher quality scores, and were rated as having better relationship skills and more use of cognitive techniques in addressing criminogenic needs. Probationers in the STICS group (N=75) had a two-year recidivism rate of 25.3%, compared with a rate of 40.5% for the control clients (N=37). Ongoing clinical support was provided to STICS officers via monthly meetings, individual feedback and refresher courses. The STICS sample was divided into those who had a high rate of participation in ongoing support (N=10) and those with low rates of participation (N=13). Not only did the high participation officers show skill enhancements, but the rate of recidivism for this group was 19% lower than the control no training group (as opposed to a 15% reduction in recidivism for the entire STICS sample). Recidivism was also examined retrospectively, to determine change in recidivism over time. While there was no change in the recidivism rates for clients in the control group, STICS clients’ rate of recidivism dropped from 46.7% (before STICS) to 25.3% (afterwards).

A study conducted in Australia had a similar premise to the work of Bonta (Trotter, 1996, 2000). Probation officers received five days of training in prosocial modeling, reinforcing pro-social activities, and discouraging pro-criminal activities. Of the original 32 officers who received training, eight left through attrition, 12 withdrew from the program, and 12 remained. Those who withdrew were compared with those who remained over a 12-48 month period. Use of skills covered in training was determined through analysis of file notes and surveys, showing that those who remained in the program were more likely to use principles of pro-social modeling and reinforcement, and demonstrate a pro-social disposition. The four-year recidivation rate was 53.8% for clients of officers using the program compared with 64% for those who did not use the model (i.e., who withdrew), suggesting that a combination of officer selection and skills training can have a significant impact on offender outcomes. This research, although promising, was methodologically weaker than the Canadian research because it did not use random assignment of officers to groups, and extrapolated officer skills from case notes rather than using direct observation.

The strengths and weaknesses of research to date

Several conclusions can be drawn from the literature to date. First, community supervision agencies may benefit from recruiting certain ‘types’ of agents – those capable of balancing the competing demands of law enforcement and social work. Second, it has been shown that the organizational climate of a community supervision agency can impact the
attitudes of staff who work there, particularly with regard to rehabilitation. There is also evidence that training can shift staff attitudes, although it is often difficult to isolate the effects of training from the self-selection bias of certain agents being attracted to a certain approach (e.g., ISP). Several research studies failed to measure attitudes over time to demonstrate attitudinal change, although, even then, survey answers may reflect a shift in what agents view as the “correct” response, rather than a shift in attitudes per se.

A useful conceptualization of supervision has been put forward by Taxman (2002), in a theoretical model that does not view supervision from the perspective of a surveillance-social work dichotomy. Instead, Taxman proposes that supervision be viewed as a process, with agents a key component in the interaction. This model places the relationship between the parole officer and parolee on center stage, and primary emphasis is given to the concept of ‘deportment’, which includes components such as eye contact, social graces, honest discussion, and empathy. It seems important to acknowledge that the communication style of the parole agent will affect the relationship with the parolee, and that the agent-parolee interaction is dynamic and therefore influenced by both actors in the process.

What the research does show is that only recently has attention been given to identifying the efficacy of supervision. Recent work has demonstrated that supervision staff, with sufficient skill-based training, can significantly improve the outcomes of the offenders they supervise. This highlights the importance of measuring not only the attitudes of agents to determine openness to engage in EBP and support organizational change - which is the research question we address here - but also agent behavior. Research should seek to get inside the ‘black box’ of supervision and describe the processes by which supervision services are actually delivered by agents. A separate component of our process evaluation will examine agent behavior during office contacts with parolees to look at what verbal techniques are used by agents, and whether these tactics are successful at eliciting change in parolee behavior. Further behavioral research could be directed at examining what distinguishes an effective from an ineffective parole agent, for instance, or what is the most effective way to train agents in the skills they need to help offenders on their path to reentry. For now, however, we concern ourselves with whether a shift in parole policy brings about a subsequent change in the attitudes of parole agents.

4. BASELINE SURVEY METHOD

Administration and sample

The survey pre-test was administered during CPSRM Phase 1 training in July, 2010. Part 1 of the survey included demographic questions and the two attitude surveys (attitudes toward rehabilitation, and attitudes toward role, both described below) and was administered to all agents on the morning of the first day prior to the commencement of training. Part 2 of the survey, administered at the completion of the second day of training, contained the knowledge questions. Both survey parts were anonymous, however, agents were asked to include their date of birth to enable matching of surveys Part 1 and 2, as well as pre-test surveys with those from the follow-up in January, 2011.

Demographic questionnaire

Agents were asked 10 questions relating to their demographic and background characteristics, including age, gender, ethnicity and race, education, and employment history. We asked these questions (a) in order to describe the sample of agents at the pilot sites, and (b) to test for relationships between demographic variables and the attitudes we measured. The demographic survey is included as Appendix A.

Attitudes toward rehabilitation survey

The Parole Agent Attitudes Toward Rehabilitation survey was originally developed by Cullen and his colleagues (Cullen, Clark, Cullen & Mathers, 1985; Cullen, Lutze, Link & Wolfe, 1989). We administered this survey (Alpha = .84) to assess change in agent attitudes regarding rehabilitation before and during the CPSRM pilot. This survey consisted of nine statements about the perceived value of offender rehabilitation, for example, whether rehabilitation works, whether prison rehabilitation programs should be expanded, and whether rehabilitation is as effective as punishment in terms of reducing crime. Items were rated on a Likert scale from one (strongly agree) to seven (strongly disagree). A rating of four reflected a neutral opinion. Three questions were reverse-scored to minimize acquiescence bias in responses. This survey is included as Appendix B.

Attitudes toward role survey

The Attitudes Toward Role survey was adapted from research conducted by Fulton et al (1997). The original Fulton measure was a 33-item survey, from which two scales were identified through factor analysis. We used one of these scales - the seven-item Subjective Role Scale with a reported Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .88 - for this research. This instrument used
semantic differentials (in which words or concepts that are opposite in meaning are placed at opposite ends of a 6-point scale) to assess the functions, roles and goals of community supervision personnel. An individual’s total score could range from seven to 42, with a lower score indicating attitudes reflecting a focus on the provision of service, importance of rehabilitation, and effective intervention. Conversely, a higher score indicates attitudes emphasizing enforcement and control. The mean score of the scale (a score of 24.5) would reflect a ‘balanced’ approach to supervision, in which equal weight was given to both rehabilitation and control. See Appendix C for a copy of this survey.

**Agent knowledge questionnaire**

Staff of the DAPO Training Academy developed for CEBC a 13-item knowledge survey, based on the CPSRM training curriculum they developed. All items were multiple-choice format with only one correct answer per question. Included in the survey were questions related to high needs referrals, criminogenic needs/dynamic risk factors, risk assessment, supervision categories, MI, electronic in home detention, incentives and rewards, COMPAS assessment, and residence verification. Agents were asked to write their date of birth at the top of this survey to enable matching this survey with Part 1, completed the day before. A copy of the survey is contained in Appendix D.

After this instrument was written, agent training was divided into three separate Phases. Consequently, two survey items (questions 2 and 8) were not covered in Phase 1 training, and were removed from the survey. We therefore report results from the remaining 11 items.

**5. BASELINE SURVEY RESULTS**

**Demographics of the baseline sample**

A total of 51 agents completed surveys on the first day of training. Their background and demographic characteristics are presented in Table 1.

**Table 1: Demographic and background characteristics of the CPSRM sample (N=51)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/Hispanic</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Multiracial</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55 years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56+ years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest education level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 year college degree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 year college degree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate degree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major area of study³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social work</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology or psychology</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal justice or criminology</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law or other social sciences</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education or humanities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² Note that total N for age is 50 since one agent entered the current date instead of their birth date.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>≤ 5 years</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time worked for DAPO</td>
<td>≤ 5 years</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21+ years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time worked for CDCR</td>
<td>≤ 5 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21+ years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time worked in corrections</td>
<td>≤ 5 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21+ years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior work experience³</td>
<td>Social casework/welfare</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Juvenile probation</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adult probation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Law enforcement</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State corrections counselor</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State corrections officer</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate prior experience³</td>
<td>Social casework/welfare</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Juvenile probation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adult probation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Law enforcement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State corrections counselor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State corrections officer</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parole agents responding to the survey were mostly male (74.5%), with a relatively even breakdown between Black (31.4%), White (25.5%), and Latino (27.5%) agents. They were highly educated; all reported having taken at least some college courses, and nearly half (47.1%) had a bachelor’s degree. While many parole agents listed multiple areas of study, over half majored in criminal justice or criminology. Another frequently reported area of study was sociology or psychology.

In general, the sample tended to include veteran employees, with an average age of just over 45 years (SD = 7.69). About 40% of the respondents had been working for DAPO for five years or less, although the majority had been working in corrections for 16 years or more, reflecting that many agents come to DAPO from a background of corrections officer or counselor. Similar to their educational backgrounds, few parole agents reported coming from a social casework/welfare background.

---

³ Total may be greater than N=51 because it includes multiple responses for several individuals.
**Attitudes toward rehabilitation**

**Analysis of the CPSRM baseline sample**

Results from the attitudes toward rehabilitation survey are presented in Table 2. The table illustrates the mean score for the group on each question; higher scores indicate disagreement with the statement and lower scores agreement. Two agents had missing data and were removed from the analysis. Despite the fact that few parole agents had a social work education or work background, respondents held relatively positive attitudes toward rehabilitation. In particular, there was a strong belief that criminals could be rehabilitated over punishment or ‘just deserts’. Agents disagreed that rehabilitation doesn’t work and is a failure, that it allows criminals to get off easily, and that punishment is the only way to reduce crime.

**Table 2: Attitudes toward rehabilitation (N=49) rated from 1 (strongly agree) to 7 (strongly disagree)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. All rehabilitation programs have done is to allow criminals who deserve to be punished to get off easily</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rehabilitating a criminal is just as important as making a criminal pay for his or her crime</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The most effective and humane cure to the crime problem in America is to make a strong effort to rehabilitate offenders</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The only way to reduce crime in our society is to punish criminals, not try to rehabilitate them</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. We should stop viewing criminals as victims of society who deserve to be rehabilitated and start paying more attention to the victims of these criminals</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I would support expanding the rehabilitation programs with criminals that are now being undertaken in our prisons</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. One of the reasons why rehabilitation programs often fail with prisoners is because they are under-funded; if enough money were available, these programs would work</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The rehabilitation of adult criminals just does not work</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The rehabilitation of parolees has proven to be a failure</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As reflected in question 6 and 7, there was also recognition by parole agents that current rehabilitation programs are under-funded and should be expanded in prison settings. The singular exception to this rehabilitative support for offenders was question 5, which indicated that most respondents agreed that more attention needed to be given to those victimized by crime over those committing it.

**CPSRM baseline sample compared with PVDMI sample**

We compared the results from this sample with those obtained during the 2008 PVDMI evaluation by CEBC to examine whether there were significant differences in attitudes from the two samples (see Table 3). The PVDMI sample included parole agents at the four PVDMI pilot sites: Stockton, Santa Maria, San Fernando Valley, and Chula Vista parole units. Agents completed the pre-test in November 2008 (N=67) and post-test in February 2009 (N=37). Scores obtained from the CPSRM sample were very similar to responses from the PVDMI samples (pre-test and post-test), indicating general support for rehabilitation by multiple groups of agents. Where there were minor differences between the two samples, responses from the CPSRM sample were slightly more in favor of rehabilitation than the PVDMI sample. Differences were not statistically significant, however; the only difference in scores that approached significance was question 9, where the CPSRM sample showed slightly greater disagreement with the statement that “the rehabilitation of parolees has proven to be a failure” than the PVDMI pre-test respondents (two-tailed t-test \( p = 0.093 \)).
Table 3: Attitudes toward rehabilitation of the CPSRM sample (N=49) and PVDMI pre-test (N=67) and post-test (N=37) samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>CPSRM</th>
<th>PVDMI Pre-Test</th>
<th>PVDMI Post-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. All rehabilitation programs have done is to allow criminals who deserve to be punished to get off easily</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>5.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rehabilitating a criminal is just as important as making a criminal pay for his or her crime</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The most effective and humane cure to the crime problem in America is to make a strong effort to rehabilitate offenders</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The only way to reduce crime in our society is to punish criminals, not try to rehabilitate them</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>5.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. We should stop viewing criminals as victims of society who deserve to be rehabilitated and start paying more attention to the victims of these criminals</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I would support expanding the rehabilitation programs with criminals that are now being undertaken in our prisons</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. One of the reasons why rehabilitation programs often fail with prisoners is because they are under-funded; if enough money were available, these programs would work</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The rehabilitation of adult criminals just does not work</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The rehabilitation of parolees has proven to be a failure</td>
<td>5.37†</td>
<td>4.88†</td>
<td>5.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a score of 1=strongly agree and 7=strongly disagree
* p < .05; †p < .10

In order to examine the group mean of the survey overall (as opposed to the means from single questions presented in Tables 2 and 3), we recoded the reverse scored questions so that, for each question, a lower score would reflect an attitude more in favor of rehabilitation. Conversely, a higher score would reflect a more punitive attitude. The mean item score for the CPSRM sample was 3.01 (SD = 0.83) on a 7-point scale, favoring rehabilitative over punitive values overall. This was very similar to the group means for the PVDMI pre-test (3.07) and post-test (3.01) samples. This pattern of findings (that is, similar results across multiple samples at different times) lends support to the reliability of the instrument.

Impact of background factors on CPSRM baseline sample

Next, we examined the mean item scores more closely to ascertain whether there were differences based on demographic or background factors.

Gender. The group means for males and females were very similar (2.96 and 3.16 respectively), and were not statistically different.

Race/ethnicity. Looking at race/ethnicity, agents who were Black had the lowest mean score (2.76), indicating an attitude more in favor of rehabilitation. Agents who identified themselves as other/multiracial had a mean of 3.71 (more punitive), while those who were White or Hispanic/Latino fell in between (2.89 and 3.05 respectively). An analysis of variance showed this difference to approach significance, $F(3, 45) = 2.45, p = .076$.

Level of education. Level of education had minimal impact on attitudes toward rehabilitation, probably because of the high level of education reported in the sample generally. Those with a graduate degree (N=9) had marginally more rehabilitative attitudes than those with some college, but not by much (2.86 compared with 3.18); this slight difference was not statistically significant. In order to increase the power of the analysis we collapsed across the four educational categories to produce two, namely (a) those with some college or a 2-year college degree (N=16), and (b) those with a four-year or graduate degree (N=33). Again, agents with a higher level of education had marginally more rehabilitative views overall (a mean score of 2.92 compared with 3.17). For two survey questions a significant difference was found between the responses of agents with higher and lower education levels; agents with less education were significantly more likely to agree that rehabilitation programs allow criminals to get off easily (two tailed t-test $p = 0.008$), and also that we should stop viewing criminals as victims of society (two tailed t-test $p = 0.061$).

Area of study. Another factor we analyzed at the group level was area of study. Again, there was only a slight (non-significant) difference; agents with a background in sociology, psychology or social work (N=9) had attitudes slightly more in favor of rehabilitation (2.76) than those majoring in criminal justice/criminology (3.10) or other majors.

Work history. We asked agents to indicate all their prior work experience, as well as their immediate prior experience before DAPO. We collapsed across categories to examine agents who were or were not previously state corrections officers. When...
considering all prior work experience, agents who had previously been a state corrections officer were slightly more punitive in their attitude toward rehabilitation (3.16) compared with those who had never been corrections officers (2.88). This difference was not statistically significant, probably due to the low power caused by small sample size. On individual survey questions, corrections officers were more punitive than non-officers on seven of the nine items; they were slightly less punitive on one question (question 6) and held similar attitudes on one question (question 1). Similar results were found when we examined immediate prior work experience (as opposed to all prior work experience); corrections officers were slightly (but not significantly) more punitive (3.21) than non-officers (2.89) and demonstrated slightly (but not significantly) more punitive views across eight of the nine survey questions.

**Length of service.** Length of time as a parole agent had a significant impact on attitude toward rehabilitation. As seen in Figure 1, agents with fewer years of experience tended to have higher scores, indicating that they were more punitive in their attitudes toward rehabilitation. When we broke down the time at DAPO into the categories presented earlier in Table 1, agents with fewer than five years at DAPO (N=21) had a mean rehabilitation score of 3.46, compared with means of 2.52 for agents with 16-20 years’ experience, and 2.27 for agents with more than 21 years’ experience. Therefore, the longer the time spent at DAPO, the more rehabilitative an agent’s attitude, $F(4,43) = 4.17, p = .006$.

**Figure 1: Total score on the rehabilitative attitude survey by length of time at DAPO**

![Figure 1: Total score on the rehabilitative attitude survey by length of time at DAPO](image)

**Multivariate analysis of the CPSRM baseline sample**

We tested the impact of each background factor, controlling for other factors, in a multivariate regression model. Results are presented in Table 4. The sample size was reduced because the regression model used a list-wise deletion process for dealing with any missing data.
Table 4: Regression results for attitude toward rehabilitation (N=45)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity (White)</td>
<td>-3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate previous job of state corrections officer</td>
<td>6.53**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in DAPO</td>
<td>-0.55***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes toward role</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>23.14***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R-squared=0.42  

\[ F(4, 40)=7.34*** \]  

***p < .001; **p < .01

Those with an immediate previous job of a state corrections officer predicted a significantly less rehabilitative attitude overall—6.53 points on average on their total survey score—compared to those who had a different previous job, including social casework or welfare, juvenile or adult probation, law enforcement, or even corrections counselor. This result supports the mean differences we observed earlier; agents who had come from a state corrections officer background were less favorable in their attitudes toward rehabilitation than agents with other work histories after controlling for the effects of other background factors. Another significant relationship was the amount of time spent at DAPO, supporting the previous finding that agents who had worked longer at DAPO rated themselves more oriented towards rehabilitation on average. It was interesting that agents with more experience were less punitive in their views, and we will discuss possible explanations to account for this finding later in the report. Other background characteristics, including race/ethnicity, did not significantly impact total attitudes toward rehabilitation; the slight differences in group means that approached statistical significance reported earlier were not significant when controlling for other factors. Interestingly, how participants responded on the attitudes toward role survey was not significant.

Comparing the CPSRM baseline sample with samples from other published studies

We compared attitudes from the CPSRM sample with samples reported from studies conducted in the 1980s using this instrument (Cullen et al, 1985; Cullen et al, 1989) in order to observe possible shifts in attitudes over time. The original research administered the survey to two samples – correctional officers, and members of the public. The corrections sample (N=155) comprised correctional officers employed in a Southern correctional system in 1983. This sample consisted mostly of males (79%), Whites (57%), with an average age of 38 years and an average length of service of 3.5 years. One in five (19%) of this sample graduated from college, and an additional 50% attended but did not complete college. The public sample (N=156) comprised randomly selected residents in Galesburg, Illinois, during 1982. This sample was 34% male, with a mean age of 46 years. Results are presented in Table 5.

The first thing of note is that our 2010 sample was much more rehabilitative in its outlook than either of the historical samples. Approximately twice as many parole agents as correctional officers thought that rehabilitation does not allow people to get off easily (question 1), that prison programs are under-funded (question 7), and that rehabilitation is not a failure (question 9). Approximately five times as many parole agents as correctional officers thought that rehabilitation does work (question 8) and that rehabilitation rather than punishment reduces crime (question 4).

When looking only at the two historical samples – correctional officers and public - it is interesting to note that officers responded in a way that was more positive toward rehabilitation on all but two of the questions (questions 1 and 9 being the only exceptions). In general, the public’s stance was much harsher concerning rehabilitation, even though one might think that correctional officers become ‘hardened’ by their interactions with criminals and thus more inclined to be punitive in their views.
### Table 5: Attitude toward rehabilitation of the CPSRM sample compared with a 1989 corrections officer and public sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>CPSRM (N=49)</th>
<th>Corrections Officer (N=155)</th>
<th>Public (N=156)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. All rehabilitation programs have done is to allow criminals who deserve to be punished to get off easily</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rehabilitating a criminal is just as important as making a criminal pay for his or her crime</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The most effective and humane cure to the crime problem in America is to make a strong effort to rehabilitate offenders</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The only way to reduce crime in our society is to punish criminals, not try to rehabilitate them</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. We should stop viewing criminals as victims of society who deserve to be rehabilitated and start paying more attention to the victims of these criminals</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>82.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I would support expanding the rehabilitation programs with criminals that are now being undertaken in our prisons</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. One of the reasons why rehabilitation programs often fail with prisoners is because they are under-funded; if enough money were available, these programs would work</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The rehabilitation of adult criminals just does not work</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The rehabilitation of parolees has proven to be a failure</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: We did not have enough information from the corrections officer and public samples to conduct significance testing.

---

Comparing the CPSRM baseline sample with a current university student sample

Since the two historical samples were collected more than twenty years ago and there is evidence that community attitudes have changed over time, we were interested to see how our parole agent sample compared with a current views in the community. In order to test this, we collected a comparison sample of UC Irvine students in order to see how student attitudes compared with our CPSRM sample. We converted the two pencil-and-paper survey measures to an online survey and recruited subjects through the UC Irvine Social Science Research Participation Pool. This subject pool provides social science students at UCI the opportunity to receive extra credit for their participation in research projects.

A total of 63 students completed surveys. Two subjects were removed from the analysis because they completed the entire survey in less than two minutes and gave the same response for every question, suggesting that they did not give the task their full attention. This gave us a final sample of N=61. Participants were predominantly female (66%), Asian (56%) or other/multiracial (18%), aged between 18 and 23 years, and studying for a degree in social sciences.

Student mean scores for the rehabilitation survey are presented in Table 6. The overall mean score for the student sample was 3.39, compared to 3.01 for the parole agent sample, revealing that students were significantly more punitive than parole agents in their outlook regarding rehabilitation (two tailed t-test \( p = .035 \)). Looking at individual survey questions, students were more punitive than agents on eight of the nine questions, the only exception being question 5, where students disagreed more often than agents that more attention should be paid to victims. On the whole, the students who participated in this survey were less in favor of offender rehabilitation than were parole agents.

We were surprised by this result, since we expected college students to be liberal in their views. What could explain this finding? The students who participated in our survey were predominantly young, Asian females living in a geographical area known for its socially conservative views. Recent research by Wendy Goldberg and her colleagues from the Department of Psychology and Social Behavior at UCI surveyed 955 students using the UCI Social Science Research Participation Pool. She found that students generally, and Asian American students in particular, were socially conservative in their views of gender roles and maternal employment. Not only did the student sample have similar views on maternal employment as a historical sample collected 25 years ago, but Asian Americans were the most ‘traditional’ in their views, significantly more likely to believe that maternal employment had adverse consequences for children. This suggests that the student sample we captured via our sampling procedures may be more conservative than a more widely sampled student population, and was not as representative a comparison group as we had hoped.
Table 6: Attitude toward rehabilitation of the CPSRM sample (N=49) compared with the UCI student sample (N=61)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>CPSRM</th>
<th>Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. All rehabilitation programs have done is to allow criminals who deserve to be punished to get off easily</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>4.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rehabilitating a criminal is just as important as making a criminal pay for his or her crime</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The most effective and humane cure to the crime problem in America is to make a strong effort to rehabilitate offenders</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The only way to reduce crime in our society is to punish criminals, not try to rehabilitate them</td>
<td>5.45†</td>
<td>5.00†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. We should stop viewing criminals as victims of society who deserve to be rehabilitated and start paying more attention to the victims of these criminals</td>
<td>3.39*</td>
<td>4.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I would support expanding the rehabilitation programs with criminals that are now being undertaken in our prisons</td>
<td>2.69*</td>
<td>3.46*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. One of the reasons why rehabilitation programs often fail with prisoners is because they are under-funded; if enough money were available, these programs would work</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The rehabilitation of adult criminals just does not work</td>
<td>5.41*</td>
<td>4.70*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The rehabilitation of parolees has proven to be a failure</td>
<td>5.37*</td>
<td>4.52*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a score of 1=strongly agree and 7=strongly disagree

*p < .05; †p < .10

Attitudes toward role

Analysis of the CPSRM baseline sample

Results from the attitudes toward role survey are presented in Table 7. Four agents with missing data were removed from the analysis. Note that we have recoded the reverse scored questions, so that for each question, a lower score (those below 3.5) reflects an attitude more in favor of the provision of service, the importance of rehabilitation, and effective intervention. Higher scores (above 3.5) reflect an emphasis on enforcement and control.

Table 7: Attitude toward role (N=47) rated from 1 (most rehabilitative) to 6 (most punitive)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean total score for group out of 42</td>
<td>24.52</td>
<td>5.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. As a parole agent, your primary obligation is to rehabilitate the offender rather than enforce supervisory conditions</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Your primary concern as a parole agent is to rehabilitate the offender rather than monitor offender compliance</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Your role is best described as a social worker rather than a police officer</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Your most appropriate role with offenders is as an advocate rather than supervisor</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The most essential part of a parole agent’s job is counseling rather than enforcing</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Your primary function as an agent is intervention rather than enforcement</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Your function as a parole agent most clearly approximates social work rather than law enforcement</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a score of 1=most rehabilitative and 6=most punitive.

Items 2, 3, 6, and 7 are presented here in their reverse-scored format.
While results from the rehabilitation survey presented in the previous section showed that agents supported rehabilitation in general, the role survey showed that agents were less likely to emphasize this in their own positions. For question 1, agents tended to value enforcing supervisory conditions slightly more than the rehabilitative function of their role, although this tendency disappeared when rating rehabilitation against the monitoring of offender compliance (question 2). It appears that agents are understandably conscious of ensuring that parole conditions are met by the parolee. This was also reflected in question 4, where agents viewed their role more in terms of supervisor rather than advocate.

Agents viewed their role as slightly more akin to social work rather than law enforcement, as reflected in questions 3, 6 and 7, where their responses tended towards the rehabilitative end of the scale. Interestingly, when asked about the conflicting roles of counseling and enforcing (question 5), agents were inclined to choose enforcing. Therefore, while agents recognize the importance of the social work function of their position, they rate enforcement higher than counseling.

We calculated the mean total score by summing responses for all questions, in order to compare this sample with samples presented in previous research. An agent’s total score could range from a low of seven (least punitive on every question) to a high of 42 (most punitive on every question), with a mean of 24.5 indicating a ‘balanced’ approach to supervision (reflecting both assistance and control values). The mean score for our sample was 24.52 ($SD = 5.08$), reflecting a balanced approach. Nearly 70% of agents fell within one standard deviation above or below the mean, that is, a total score between 19.44 and 29.57. This is consistent with previous research, which reported means of 19.50 for ISP probation officers who received comprehensive training and development, compared with regular supervision officers, who scored 26.15 (Fulton et al, 1997).

Impact of background factors on the CPSRM baseline sample

Next, we looked for differences between group item means.

Gender. Females rated themselves as slightly more rehabilitative than males (3.16 compared with 3.61); this difference approached statistical significance (two tailed t-test $p = .069$). So, while males and females had very similar attitudes toward rehabilitation in general, when it came to how they perceived their job, females tended to be more open to an approach that emphasized rehabilitation.

Race/ethnicity. Looking at race/ethnicity, no statistically significant differences were found. Black agents reported a slightly lower group mean (3.31), indicating they were the most rehabilitative in their approach, and White agents were the least rehabilitative towards their role (3.89). Agents who were Hispanic/Latino (3.41) and those classified as other/multiracial (3.43) were somewhere in between.

Level of education. The group means for level of education were very similar to each other, showing no trends. Even when we collapsed across the education categories there was only a marginal difference in the mean score for those with some college or a 2-year degree (3.43) compared with agents with four years of college or a graduate degree (3.54). Area of study, although not statistically significant, showed an interesting trend in that agents with an educational background in sociology, psychology or social work (N=9) actually rated themselves as the least rehabilitative in their role, with a mean of 3.77 (compared with 3.0 for agents who had studied in the fields of education, humanities or law, and 3.44 for criminal justice/criminology). It is possible that people who studied in the fields of psychology/social work but who went on to a law enforcement career in parole tended to be more punitive in their views than those who continued on in the field and went on to become psychologists or social workers.

Work history. Turning to work history, we collapsed across categories to compare the means for agents who had come from a corrections officer background versus those who had not. Unlike general attitude toward rehabilitation, agents with a correctional officer background were no more punitive in their views of their role than non-officers either for immediate prior work experience (3.51 for officers compared with 3.49 for non-officers) or all prior work experience (3.56 for officers compared with 3.45 for non-officers).

Length of service. Lastly, the relationship we observed with the rehabilitation survey between length of time at DAPO and general rehabilitative attitude wasn’t evident here. The flat line pictured in Figure 2 shows no relationship between time at DAPO and attitude toward role.
Multivariate analysis of the CPSRM baseline sample

Similar to the regression for attitudes toward rehabilitation, we also ran a model for attitudes toward role. To adjust for heteroskedasticity in the error term (where the variance of the error is not constant), we used robust standard errors in estimating the model (Wooldridge, 2009). As seen in Table 8, female agents tended to view their role in a more rehabilitative light than did males, a relationship that approached significance. Those that responded being White reported significantly more punitive scores than nonwhites by an average of 3.84 points. Unlike agents’ responses on the general rehabilitation survey, the immediate previous job of being a corrections officer appeared to have no effect on attitudes towards their role. Surprisingly, those with an educational background in sociology, psychology, or social work had significantly more punitive attitudes towards their role than those who did not. Attitudes toward rehabilitation appeared to have a fairly small effect that approached significance on agents’ responses about their role.

Table 8: Regression results for attitude toward role (N=46)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-3.82†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity (White)</td>
<td>3.84*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate previous job of state corrections officer</td>
<td>-2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of study of sociology, psychology, or social work</td>
<td>3.70*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes toward rehabilitation</td>
<td>0.20†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>19.28***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R-squared=0.29

$F(5, 40)=3.30^*$

**p < .001; *p < .05; †p < .10

Note: robust standard errors were used
Comparing the CPSRM baseline sample with the university student sample

We now present findings from the UC Irvine student sample (N=61) on the attitude toward role survey. Since it was likely that few students had come into contact with parole agents, we changed this survey slightly to include a brief statement describing the parole agent role prior to presenting the survey questions. Results from the student sample are presented in Table 9.

The mean total score for students was 27.11, again making students significantly more punitive than parole agents (mean total score 24.52). Apart from question five, in which students and parole agents responded in a similar manner, students were uniformly more punitive in their views than parole agents. This result was contrary to what we initially expected. Perhaps the students responding to the survey (predominantly young, Asian females living in Orange County) held socially conservative views, or perhaps they viewed the concepts of punishment and rehabilitation differently from people working within the criminal justice system.

Table 9: Attitude toward role of the CPSRM sample (N=49) compared with the UCI student sample (N=61) rated from 1 (most rehabilitative) to 6 (most punitive)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>CPSRM</th>
<th>Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean total score for group out of 42</td>
<td>24.52*</td>
<td>27.11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. As a parole agent, your primary obligation is to rehabilitate the offender rather than enforce supervisory conditions</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Your primary concern as a parole agent is to rehabilitate the offender rather than monitor offender compliance</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Your role is best described as a social worker rather than a police officer</td>
<td>3.23†</td>
<td>3.67†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Your most appropriate role with offenders is as an advocate rather than supervisor</td>
<td>3.90†</td>
<td>4.36†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The most essential part of a parole agent's job is counseling rather than enforcing</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Your primary function as an agent is intervention rather than enforcement</td>
<td>3.14†</td>
<td>3.64†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Your function as a parole agent most clearly approximates social work rather than law enforcement</td>
<td>3.35†</td>
<td>3.80†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a score of 1 = most rehabilitative and 6 = most punitive. Items 2, 3, 6, and 7 are presented here in their reverse-scored format. *p < .05; †p < .10

The relationship between the two CPSRM baseline survey measures

When we explored the relationship between the two survey measures (i.e., attitude toward role, attitude toward rehabilitation) we found they were moderately correlated ($r = .332$), which tells us that approximately 11% of one survey score was explained by the other. The scatter plot presented in Figure 3 displays the slight positive relationship between the two variables: in general, agents scoring higher on the role survey tended to score higher on the rehabilitation survey, but not by much. Agents were fairly homogeneous in their attitudes regarding their role, with most agents clustering between a score of 20-30 points. However, agents were more dispersed in their rehabilitation scores, with some agents scoring in the low teens and others above 40. It appears, then, that some agents had positive attitudes in favor of rehabilitation generally, yet still viewed their role in a manner that stressed the law enforcement functions rather than the rehabilitative ones. We conclude from this finding that attitudes toward role ‘trumped’ general attitudes toward rehabilitation.

---

4 This statement read “parole agents are responsible for the supervision of offenders who have recently been released from prison and assisting them with reintegration into the community.”
Figure 3: Total role score by total rehabilitation score

Dividing the CPSRM baseline sample into ‘rehabilitative’ and ‘punitive’ agents

In order to fully explore the relationships among attitudes and other variables, we divided agents into high and low groups based on their attitudes. Two research questions arise. First, how were agents at the ‘rehabilitative’ end of the scale different from those at the ‘punitive’ end? Second, do findings emerge by adjusting the lens to focus on these high- and low-scoring agents that were not apparent when we averaged across all agents?

The first task was to decide the cutoff points for group selection. Looking first at the role survey, we mentioned previously that the majority of agents (more than 70%) scored close to (i.e. within one standard deviation of) the mean score. Consequently, using 1 SD to select agents at the tail ends of the distribution would result in too few agents in the two groups. We therefore used 0.5 SD, which resulted in 12 agents selected into the ‘punitive role’ group, and seven agents into the ‘rehabilitative role’ group. Looking at the distribution of group scores presented in Figure 4, this cut off point seems to select those agents at the high and low ends of the sample in an unambiguous way.
We used the same method to select agents scoring at the high and low ends of the general attitude toward rehabilitation survey. As seen in Figure 5, this resulted in 17 agents in the 'punitive' group, and 15 agents in the 'rehabilitative' group.
We next examined the composition of high and low groups from the two surveys measures to see whether agents classified as 'rehabilitative' on one survey measure were also in the 'rehabilitative' group on the other, and vice versa. Alternatively, it was possible that there was no or little overlap in group membership, since the surveys seemed to be measuring different concepts.

As seen in the upper part of Figure 6, there were 15 agents in the 'rehabilitative' group on the general attitude toward rehabilitation survey. Of these 15 agents, five agents were not selected into a high or low group on the role survey (i.e., they were in the 'neutral' middle ground); five agents also held highly rehabilitative attitudes on the role survey (i.e., they held consistently rehabilitative views); and five agents held highly punitive attitudes on the role survey (i.e., they held views that were inconsistent across surveys). This tells us that just because agents thought rehabilitation was a good thing generally, this did not preclude them from thinking about their role in a 'law enforcement', as opposed to 'social worker', role. However, the opposite was not the case – agents who were more opposed to rehabilitation generally tended to not 'flip' and view their role in a way that emphasized rehabilitation. To summarize, 16 agents were selected into high or low groups on both surveys measures - 10 of these in a manner that was consistent (for example, a rehabilitative attitude on both measures), and six agents in a manner that was inconsistent (for example, rehabilitative on one measure and punitive on the other).

**Figure 6: Overlap in group membership on the two survey measures**

![Diagram showing overlap in group membership on the two survey measures](image-url)
Background differences between ‘rehabilitative’ and ‘punitive’ groups

We then looked at the demographic and background characteristics of agents selected into the high and low groups for both attitude measures to see if any trends emerged. Due to the small sample sizes involved caution should be taken when interpreting these results.

Gender. The first thing we noted was that all 12 agents in the ‘punitive role’ group were male. Given the greater number of males overall in the sample (74.5% were male) was this unusual? A Fisher’s test was used to test for statistical significance, which told us that the proportion of males in the ‘punitive’ group was in fact higher than expected by chance alone ($p < .05$). Another way of exploring this result was to rank order agents according to their score, from highest score (most punitive) to lowest score (most rehabilitative), then look at whether each agent in succession was male or female. We did this, and as we did so we calculated the proportion of males at each step in the process. We know that the overall proportion of males in the sample was about 75%. Was this proportion stable at the high and low ends of the entire sample, or did it fluctuate, demonstrating clusters of males grouped together at different points? The results are presented in Figure 7.

Figure 7: Proportion of males, ranked from ‘most punitive’ role scores on the left to ‘most rehabilitative’ on the right

![Figure 7: Proportion of males, ranked from ‘most punitive’ role scores on the left to ‘most rehabilitative’ on the right](image)

The figure shows the proportion of males for the entire sample on the dashed line. What can be observed is that the first 13 agents in the rank-ordered list were all males, forming a cluster at the most punitive end of the scale. As females were discovered in the rank-ordered list, this gradually lowered the proportion of males, until the proportion finally represented the overall proportion of the entire sample (75%). This result suggests that males, but not females, were more inclined to see their role in a more enforcing light, stressing law enforcement, surveillance, and monitoring, and is consistent with our regression results reported earlier.

Was this trend in gender evident in agents’ general attitudes toward rehabilitation? The answer was no – both males and females alike were found at both the highly rehabilitative and punitive ends of the scale. Figure 8 shows a fairly stable proportion of males across the sample (note that we expect a certain level of instability initially, since the first data point must necessarily be either 100% or 0%). In summary, males and females were generally equivalent when it came to general attitudes toward the value of rehabilitating offenders, but they saw their role slightly differently, with females having more of a ‘social work’ orientation.
Race/ethnicity. We did a similar analysis for race/ethnicity, looking first at the frequency of different racial categories in the high/low groups and then graphing proportions in the rank-ordered sample. Given our previous findings concerning race/ethnicity, we were likely to demonstrate similar findings here, and that was the case. Starting with the role survey, a noticeable trend was that half the ‘punitive’ group comprised agents who were White, while White agents made up only a quarter of the sample generally. A Fisher’s test was used to see whether the observed frequencies of racial categories were different than expected, and this approached significance ($p = .056$). Figure 9 shows this over-representation of White agents, and the under-representation of Black and other/multiracial agents, at the punitive end of the role scale, which is what we found previously.
Turning to the general attitudes toward rehabilitation survey, of the 15 agents in the ‘rehabilitative’ group, seven of them were Black and none were other/multiracial \( (p = .004) \). This time when we graphed the proportions we reversed the ordering of agents, ranking them in ascending order from least to most punitive (because this provided a clearer picture). Figure 10 (over page), unlike the previous graphs, therefore shows the ‘rehabilitative’ agents on the left. We can see that Black agents were found disproportionately at the rehabilitative end of the scale, tending to have attitudes more in favor of the rehabilitation of offenders than other racial groups. On the other hand, there was not a single agent identified as other/multiracial among the first 20 agents, indicating that their attitudes toward rehabilitation generally tended to be more punitive.

**Length of service.** Lastly, we looked at length of time served on the job, which mirrored previous findings; agents in the two rehabilitative groups tended to have longer time on the job than agents in the punitive groups. As before, this trend was stronger with the attitude toward rehabilitation survey than the role survey. For example, agents in the ‘rehabilitative role’ group reported 15.7 years at DAPO compared with 5.9 years for the ‘punitive role’ group \( (p < .001) \).
There were no other findings that came to light by the narrowing of the focus to include only agents who had high or low scores. Agents in the ‘rehabilitative role’ group held attitudes slightly more in favor of rehabilitation generally compared with agents in the ‘punitive role’ group (20.86 compared with 25.67), and agents in the ‘rehabilitative’ group viewed their role in a slightly more treatment-oriented fashion than agents in the ‘punitive’ group (23.73 compared with 25.73), but these differences did not approach statistical significance, partly due to the small sample size.

**Agent knowledge**

On the second day of training, 39 agents responded to a multiple choice knowledge survey. Knowledge questions were written by DAPO training staff and covered Phase 1 subject content covered during training.

The average number of questions answered correctly was only 6.29 out of 11 questions ($SD = 1.35$). The distribution of number of correct responses is presented in Figure 11. As suggested by the mean score, most agents answered six questions correctly. At the upper end, two agents answered nine questions correctly, and an additional three agents answered eight correctly. At the lower end, one agent identified only three correct answers, and two agents answered only four questions correctly.
Results from individual knowledge questions are presented in Table 10. Although the average number of questions answered correctly was only six, there was a high level of consistency—both for questions answered correctly and incorrectly—in agent responses. Agents’ knowledge of supervision categories was excellent; approximately 90% of agents responded correctly to questions about the highest risk control (question 4) and the new supervision categories (question 5). In fact, when including agents who gave multiple responses to question 5 that also included the correct answer, 37 of 39 responded correctly. When asked about the supervision category for parolees who are identified as “court walkover or paper commitments” (question 9), over 80% responded correctly. Knowledge of the rewards and incentives program was less consistent, with over three-quarters of respondents defining a level I incentive (question 10), but only about 40% knowing how many levels there were in total (question 11). Readers are referred to Appendix D for a complete list of knowledge questions.
Table 10: Knowledge survey, number and percent of correct responses (N=39)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean number of questions answered correctly out of 11* (SD)</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>(1.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Items:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. High needs referrals</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>82.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Criminogenic needs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Highest risk control</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>92.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Supervision categories</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Motivational interviewing principles</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The six dynamic risk factors</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>71.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Court walkover and/or paper commitment</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>82.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Level I rewards and incentives</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Rewards and incentive program levels</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. COMPAS assessment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Residency verification</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: only 31 respondents answered all survey questions and were included in the mean.
Note also that questions 2 and 8 were removed from the survey since Phase 1 training did not cover this content.

General knowledge of risks and needs appeared to be relatively high as well. Over 80% of respondents recognized the criteria for high needs referrals (question 1). A slightly lower proportion (72%) correctly identified the six dynamic risk factors as criminogenic needs (question 7). On the other hand, when asked to identify which factors were not criminogenic needs, only five agents answered correctly (question 3). Thus, agents either appeared to have some general but not specific knowledge about risks and needs, or they had good knowledge of risks and needs but may have responded incorrectly to question 3 due to question wording.

The remaining questions demonstrated lack of knowledge. Fewer than half the agents (45%) knew when the residency verification had to be completed, less than a quarter (22%) correctly answered the question about COMPAS assessments, and only two agents knew which term was not a basic MI technique. With one exception, questions that agents generally missed were negatively worded. For example, 80% of respondents incorrectly identified illiteracy or employment as terms that were not criminogenic needs.

The relationship between CPSRM baseline attitudes and knowledge

It could be argued that agents who view their role in a more rehabilitative, treatment-oriented fashion may be more amenable to the organizational change in this direction brought about through parole reform. If this is the case, perhaps these agents have more ‘buy in’ to the reform process, and may perform better on the knowledge survey because the concepts presented in training are more consistent with their own philosophy about their role. For this reason, we looked at whether agents in the highly ‘rehabilitative role’ group answered more questions correctly in the knowledge survey.

This proved not to be the case. Both the ‘rehabilitative role’ group and the ‘punitive role’ groups answered about six questions correctly, with no statistically significant difference between their mean correct response scores. If agents classified as rehabilitative were in fact more receptive to training, then this receptivity was not evident in their knowledge scores.

6. DISCUSSION OF BASELINE SURVEY FINDINGS

Before moving on to the follow-up surveys, we will consider what we have learned to date.

First, pilot site agents thought that rehabilitation worked. Agents generally had positive attitudes towards the value of offender rehabilitation; they thought it was an important and necessary step in effective prisoner reentry. Agents in general agreed that prison rehabilitation programs should be expanded, and they believed that rehabilitation was important in reducing crime. However, agents also thought that more resources should be allocated to the victims of crime, rather than the perpetrators of crime.
The second conclusion to be drawn from the baseline results is that not all agents were alike in their attitudes. For example, agents who had more experience at DAPO held attitudes more in favor of rehabilitation, while those with fewer years of experience were more punitive in their attitudes. There are two possible explanations for this finding. The first is that agents recruited some time ago were different from agents recruited recently – these agents were always more in favor of rehabilitation and drawn to the ‘social worker’ aspect of a parole agent career. The second explanation is that, having ‘seen it all’, agents with more experience actually changed their attitudes over time and became more in favor of rehabilitating offenders compared with agents with less experience. From the point of view of parole reform, this finding is interesting in that it suggests that veteran employees may be more amenable to the shift in policy introduced with CPSRM than recent recruits.

We also observed that agents from varying ethnic and racial backgrounds tended to have different attitudes at the high and low ends of the attitude scales, with Black and Latino/Hispanic agents tending to be more rehabilitative in their outlook, and Whites more punitive in relation to their role as agent. It has been suggested in the literature that Black parole agents may be more likely to have friends or family members who have come into contact with the criminal justice system, and hence be more sensitive to the conditions that lead to criminal behavior. This explanation was used by Grattet et al (2008) to account for their finding that parolees supervised by Black agents had lower rates of technical and least serious criminal parole violations. In addition, female agents often viewed their role in a less punitive light than their male peers. This lends support to the notion that corrections organizations should aim for a mix of agent backgrounds in order to reflect the communities they serve; diversity may promote a wider range of views within an organization, in turn reducing a ‘one size fits all’ approach to supervision and increasing the responsivity of the organization.

Overall, agents balanced the competing roles of social worker and law enforcer, on average falling mid-way between the surveillance and treatment functions of their role. Particular survey questions drew out imbalances. Agents in general rated social work as a more important function than both law enforcement and police officer, appearing to reject the label of ‘cop’. However, making sure that parole conditions were met appeared to be of primary importance to agents, swaying them to choose the enforcement of supervisory conditions over rehabilitation, as well as the functions of supervisor over advocate and enforcing over counseling. Therefore, agents recognized that much of their role was concerned with ensuring that parolees adhered to their conditions of supervision.

There was a moderate relationship between the two attitude surveys themselves. As we saw when looking only at ‘rehabilitative’ and ‘punitive’ agents, some agents held positive views about rehabilitation in general, yet saw their role in a manner that emphasized the surveillance or law enforcement function. This relationship did not exist in the opposite direction – agents who held more punitive attitudes towards offender rehabilitation were not likely to have a more treatment-focused view of their role. This means that whether agents were particularly ‘rehabilitative’ in their outlook did not necessarily mean that they were more treatment-oriented with parolees, because their role attitudes ‘trumped’ their general attitudes.

The final conclusion to be drawn from the baseline surveys was that some agents may have learned little from the training, as evidenced from a few extremely low scores on the knowledge survey. On average, agents answered about half the questions right, even though the questions were developed by the same DAPO training academy personnel who developed the training curriculum. There were no training evaluations done at the time to gather feedback from agents regarding their perceptions of training, and as a result it is difficult to draw conclusions about the value of Phase 1 training and potential areas for improvement.

7. FOLLOW-UP SURVEY METHOD

Administration

Follow-up surveys were administered to agents during Phase 3 CPSRM training on January 11th – 12th, 2011. The survey instrument included (a) the demographic questionnaire, (b) the Parole Agent Attitudes Toward Rehabilitation survey, and (c) the Attitudes Toward Role survey. This survey was identical to the baseline instrument except for the addition of an item in the demographic questionnaire asking whether agents had completed a survey during baseline or not (to assist us matching surveys from baseline to follow-up). This survey, unlike the baseline, did not include a knowledge component.

We did not conduct follow-up surveys with the university student sample; consequently, all analyses reported from this point forward concern only the CPSRM sample and change in pilot site parole agent attitudes over time.

8. FOLLOW-UP SURVEY RESULTS

Demographics of the follow-up sample

A total of 36 agents filled out follow-up surveys during Phase 3 CPSRM training. Thirty-four of these agents had also completed baseline surveys administered during Phase 1 training, so only two agents were new to the sample. It is likely that these two agents were recent graduates of the parole agent academy who had replaced retiring agents, since the mean age and mean
length of service for the follow-up sample decreased slightly over time even though there was a five month interval between survey periods. We checked that these two new agents were not outliers (i.e., markedly different from their peers in their attitudes) and since they were not they were included in the follow-up analysis.

The background and demographic characteristics of the follow-up sample are presented in Table 11.

**Table 11: Demographic and background characteristics of the follow-up CPSRM sample (N=36)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>63.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/Hispanic</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Multiracial</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56+ years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest education level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 year college degree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 year college degree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate degree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major area of study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology or psychology</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal justice or criminology</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law or other social sciences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education or humanities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time worked for DAPO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤ 5 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21+ years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time worked for CDCR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤ 5 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21+ years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time worked in corrections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤ 5 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21+ years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 11 (cont.): Demographic and background characteristics of the follow-up CPSRM sample (N=36)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior work experience(^1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social casework/welfare</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile probation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult probation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State corrections counselor</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State corrections officer</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate prior experience(^1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social casework/welfare</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile probation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult probation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State corrections counselor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State corrections officer</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Total may be greater than N=36 because it includes multiple responses for several individuals

We compared the demographic characteristics of the follow-up sample with those who completed surveys at baseline to see if there were any differences in background that may have contributed to attitudinal change over time. There were no statistically significant differences in the demographics of agents from the baseline to the follow-up period.

The follow-up sample (N=36) was smaller than the baseline sample (N=51). This may have been because some pilot site agents did not attend follow-up training because they were on leave or had retired from DAPO. Alternatively, it is possible that a small number of non-pilot site DAPO personnel (such as regional administrative staff) who were present during the initial Phase 1 CPSRM training session completed surveys.

Sample size and missing data

The background characteristics presented in Table 11 represents the full follow-up sample – all 36 agents who completed follow-up surveys. In the analyses to follow, we first present results from this full follow-up sample and discuss change in attitudes of the follow-up group compared to the baseline group. We then narrow our focus and examine the responses from the sub-set of agents who completed surveys at both baseline and follow-up, in order to assess change in the attitudes of individual agents over time. Note that we excluded agents with missing survey data; only when an agent answered all items on a survey were they included in the analysis for that survey.

Attitudes toward role – group change over time

Analysis of the CPSRM follow-up sample

In this section, we present findings from the role survey - and not the rehabilitation survey – first, since these results are easier to interpret and we felt it would help readers to understand the results.

Three agents were removed from the sample due to missing data. Results are presented in Table 12, along with results from the baseline survey for comparison purposes. Note that we have recoded the reverse-scored questions, such that lower scores (those below 3.5) reflect an attitude more in favor of rehabilitation, and higher scores (those above 3.5) reflect an emphasis on law enforcement. The table includes standard deviations (SD) for the follow-up sample, which show that agents were fairly consistent in their responses across items. To assist with interpretation, since higher scores indicate more punitive attitudes, if a score increased from baseline to follow-up then attitudes became more punitive over time. Conversely, if a score decreased over time, this represented a shift in attitude towards a more rehabilitative approach to agent role.
Table 12: Attitude toward role of the CPSRM follow-up sample (N=33) compared to the baseline sample (N=47)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Baseline Mean</th>
<th>Follow-up Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean total score for group out of 42</td>
<td>24.52</td>
<td>23.77 (4.52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. As a parole agent, your primary obligation is to rehabilitate the offender rather than enforce supervisory conditions</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.73 (1.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Your primary concern as a parole agent is to rehabilitate the offender rather than monitor offender compliance</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.14 (1.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Your role is best described as a social worker rather than a police officer</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.17 (0.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Your most appropriate role with offenders is as an advocate rather than supervisor</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.88 (1.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The most essential part of a parole agent’s job is counseling rather than enforcing</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.65 (1.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Your primary function as an agent is intervention rather than enforcement</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.15 (0.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Your function as a parole agent most clearly approximates social work rather than law enforcement</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.06 (0.85)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: A score of 1=most rehabilitative and 6=most punitive
Items 2, 3, 6, and 7 are presented here in their reverse-scored format
Three participants were excluded from the follow-up sample due to missing data

There was a slight but non-significant trend overall for the group of agents surveyed at follow-up to view their role in a more rehabilitative light, emphasizing the provision of service, the importance of rehabilitation, and effective intervention, than the group surveyed at baseline. The total mean decreased from 24.52 at baseline (a ‘balanced’ approach) to 23.77 at follow-up (an approach slightly favoring rehabilitation over law enforcement). Many of the survey questions remained essentially the same across time periods. Two questions – questions 2 and 7 – demonstrated a noticeable shift (although still minor and non-significant) in attitudes. At follow-up, agents were slightly more likely to think that the primary concern of a parole agent was rehabilitation as opposed to monitoring offender compliance, and that the function of a parole agent was closer to that of social worker than law enforcement. The only question that showed a very slight change towards a more punitive attitude was the first question; agents in the follow-up sample saw their role in terms of favoring the enforcement of supervisory conditions slightly more than the baseline sample did, although not by very much.

We can conclude from this result that on the whole the follow-up sample showed similar attitudes toward their role as the baseline sample. Only two items demonstrated a slight shift in attitude toward a more rehabilitative role over time, which brought the group mean down slightly – but non-significantly – over time. These two items particularly related to the social worker – law enforcement dichotomy, and the competing demands of rehabilitation versus monitoring compliance.

Impact of background factors on the CPSRM follow-up sample

Next we looked at mean scores according to demographic and background factors for the full follow-up sample (N=33). Recall that when we looked at mean role scores at baseline we found that agents who were more rehabilitative in their approach to their role were more likely to be female and non-White.

Gender. Looking at the follow-up group, gender again played a role, with males significantly more punitive (3.60) than females (2.99, p = .008). Whites were also slightly more punitive (3.56) than other/multiracial (3.27), but not by much; there was no significant difference for race/ethnicity. Agent age did not seem to influence how they viewed their role, with only slight variation in mean scores for age groups and no statistically significant results found.

Level of education. Education had minimal impact – those with a graduate degree saw their role in a slightly more rehabilitative light (3.10) than those with some college (3.48) or two years of college (3.57). When we collapsed across educational categories, agents who had higher level of education (a 4-year or graduate degree) had slightly but not significantly more rehabilitative views on their role (3.32) than those with only some college or a 2-year degree (3.52). One question demonstrated a significant difference between education levels; those with less education more often agreed that prisoner education programs were under-funded (question 7, two tailed t-test p = .033).

Work history. Recalling that correctional officers were no different in their attitude toward role than non-correctional officers at baseline, what did we find at follow-up? As can be seen in Figure 12, even though the two groups of agents had similar attitudes to begin with, those who immediately came to DAPO from a background other than corrections officer became slightly
less punitive in their role over time (a total score of 23.19) compared with agents who were corrections officers (24.79). The difference between corrections and non-corrections agents at follow-up was not statistically significant, however. A similar pattern was found when we looked at all prior work experience (as opposed to immediate prior work experience).

**Figure 12: Total role score over time for agents who were/were not corrections officers**

![Graph showing total role score over time for agents who were/were not corrections officers.]

*Length of service.* Length of service within DAPO did not demonstrate a clear linear relationship with attitude toward role (see Figure 13). Agents who were most rehabilitative in their approach at follow-up had between six and ten years’ experience (2.96), followed by those with 11-15 years (3.19). Those with fewer than five years’ experience had about the same mean score (3.57) as those with more than 16 years (3.52).
Multivariate analysis of the CPSRM follow-up sample

We ran a regression model to test for the impact of background factors while controlling for other variables. Due to the small sample size, we limited the model to include only a few variables of interest and again used robust standard errors in estimating the model (Wooldridge, 2009). Results are presented in Table 13, and show that gender predicted role score: females reported significantly less punitive total role scores by an average of more than four points. We ran several different two-variable and three-variable models (due to the limited sample size) to check other background variables, but gender was the only variable that was statistically significant. Holding other factors constant, there was no influence of race/ethnicity, length of service, education or prior work history (state corrections officer) on role score.

Table 13: Regression results for attitude toward role at follow-up (N=33)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-4.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate previous job of state corrections officer</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>24.77***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R-squared=0.22  
F(2, 30)=4.23*  
***p < .001; *p < .05  
Note: robust standard errors were used

Attitudes toward role – individual change over time

The analysis thus far has looked at the baseline and follow-up groups as a whole. Since we asked agents to write their date of birth on the surveys, we were able to match survey responses from time one (baseline) with those from time two (follow-up)
for those agents who completed both sets of surveys. This enabled us to examine change in the attitudes of individual agents
over time. Results for the role survey are presented in Table 14.

Table 14 shows a slight shift in the attitudes of individual agents over time in the direction of a ‘social work’ approach to
supervision, and away from a ‘law enforcement’ approach to their role. The mean total score reduced slightly (but non-
significantly) from 24.84 to 23.30 – about 1.5 points overall. All items on the role survey elicited a response slightly more in
favor of rehabilitation at follow-up compared with baseline. The shift in attitude was only small, and again was strongest for
questions 2 and 7.

**Table 14: Attitude toward role for agents who completed both baseline and follow-up surveys (N=28)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Follow-up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean total score for group out of 42</td>
<td>24.84</td>
<td>23.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. As a parole agent, your primary obligation is to rehabilitate the offender rather than enforce supervisory conditions</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Your primary concern as a parole agent is to rehabilitate the offender rather than monitor offender compliance</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Your role is best described as a social worker rather than a police officer</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Your most appropriate role with offenders is as an advocate rather than supervisor</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The most essential part of a parole agent’s job is counseling rather than enforcing</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Your primary function as an agent is intervention rather than enforcement</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Your function as a parole agent most clearly approximates social work rather than law enforcement</td>
<td>3.41*</td>
<td>3.00*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a score of 1=most rehabilitative and 6=most punitive
Items 2, 3, 6, and 7 are presented here in their reverse-scored format
Six participants were excluded due to missing data
*p < .05

We conclude from this analysis that agents recognized a very slight change in their role during the pilot implementation
towards a ‘social work’ orientation. Agents at pilot sites who were surveyed prior to CPSRM implementation and then five
months later showed a slight tendency to view their role in a more rehabilitative light after the introduction of CPSRM than
they did prior to its implementation. The change in attitudes was small and statistically non-significant (except for question 7),
but it was consistent across all survey items.

**Attitudes toward rehabilitation – group change over time**

**Analysis of the CPSRM follow-up sample**

As with the role survey, we first examined the full follow-up sample before turning our attention to individual agents who
completed surveys at both time intervals. Table 15 presents the means and standard deviations for the full follow-up group.5
We include results from the baseline survey for comparison purposes.

---

5 N=35; one agent was removed from the sample due to missing data
Table 15: Attitude toward rehabilitation of the CPSRM follow-up sample (N=35) compared to the baseline sample (N=49)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Baseline Mean</th>
<th>Follow-up Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. All rehabilitation programs have done is to allow criminals who deserve to be punished to get off easily</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>4.94 (1.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rehabilitating a criminal is just as important as making a criminal pay for his or her crime</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.74 (1.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The most effective and humane cure to the crime problem in America is to make a strong effort to rehabilitate offenders</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>2.62 (1.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The only way to reduce crime in our society is to punish criminals, not try to rehabilitate them</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>5.43 (1.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. We should stop viewing criminals as victims of society who deserve to be rehabilitated and start paying more attention to the victims of these criminals</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.31 (1.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I would support expanding the rehabilitation programs with criminals that are now being undertaken in our prisons</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.89 (1.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. One of the reasons why rehabilitation programs often fail with prisoners is because they are under-funded; if enough money were available, these programs would work</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>4.09 (1.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The rehabilitation of adult criminals just does not work</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>4.97 (1.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The rehabilitation of parolees has proven to be a failure</td>
<td>5.37†</td>
<td>4.80† (1.39)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a score of 1=strongly agree and 7=strongly disagree
One participant was excluded from the follow-up sample due to missing data
†p < .10

Questions 2, 3, 6 and 7 were worded in a direction that was favorable of rehabilitation; lower scores on these questions at follow-up compared to baseline would indicate an attitudinal shift in favor of rehabilitation, and higher scores a more punitive attitude. What did we observe? Question 2 remained about the same over time, indicating no change in attitude. Question 3, concerning rehabilitation being an effective and humane cure to the problem of crime, showed that agents agreed with this statement at follow-up slightly more often than baseline (becoming slightly more rehabilitative in their views). However, questions 6 and 7 showed the opposite trend – agents became slightly more punitive over time when asked about whether prison rehabilitation programs should be expanded or receive more funding.

Questions 1, 4, 5, 8 and 9 were worded in a direction that was opposed to rehabilitation; for these questions, lower scores at follow-up reflected a more punitive attitude, and higher scores a more rehabilitative attitude. The first question, relating to the relative merits of rehabilitation versus punishment, showed that agents became slightly (but not significantly so) more rehabilitative over time. Questions 4 and 5 remained fairly stable over time. The last two questions – that rehabilitation doesn’t work and is a failure – demonstrated a more noticeable shift in agent attitudes in the direction of punitiveness. That is, agents were more likely to agree that rehabilitation did not work and had proven to be a failure after the new parole model was implemented than before.

Recall that the mean score (with reverse scored questions recoded) for the baseline sample was 3.01. The mean for the full follow-up sample was 3.21, representing a slight (but non-significant) trend toward more punitive attitudes over time. This result was unexpected, and will be discussed in more detail shortly when we focus on individual change over time.

Impact of background factors on the CPSRM follow-up sample

Next we looked at the impact of background factors on mean scores. Baseline results found that agents who were more rehabilitative had a tendency to be Black, have greater length of service, and come from a professional background other than corrections officer.

Gender. Looking at the full follow-up sample, the group means for males and females were not significantly different (3.19 versus 3.25 respectively).

Race/ethnicity. As with the baseline results, agents who identified themselves as other/multiracial had the highest (most punitive) mean score of 3.76 (compared with 3.08 for Black, 3.08 for White, and 3.18 for Latino/Hispanic), but this difference was not statistically significant.

Level of education. Looking at education, there was no significant difference across the four educational categories. The highest (most punitive) score was reported by agents with some college (3.43); however, those with two years of college were slightly
more rehabilitative in their views (2.80) compared to those who had a graduate degree (2.92). When we collapsed across categories, agents with two years or less of college actually held marginally more rehabilitative views of their role (3.18) than agents with a higher level of education (3.23).

**Work history.** When we compared agents who came to DAPO from a career as a corrections officers, compared with some other work background, both groups of agents became slightly more punitive regarding the value of rehabilitation at follow-up (see Figure 14), but the gap observed between corrections officer and non-corrections officer agents at follow-up was not significant.

**Figure 14: Total rehabilitation score over time for agents who were/were not corrections officers**

![Figure 14](image)

**Length of service.** Again, length of service as a parole agent was associated with attitude; agents who had worked at DAPO for less than five years had a mean score of 3.46 (more punitive attitudes) compared with 2.74 for agents who had worked at DAPO for 16-20 years. This relationship is presented in Figure 15.
Multivariate analysis of the CPSRM follow-up sample

Results from the regression model are presented in Table 16. Again we limited our model selection to only a couple of variables due to limited sample size. Length of service at DAPO was the only background variable that significantly predicted rehabilitation score – for every extra year with DAPO, rehabilitation score decreased by almost half a point. We ran a few different models to make sure that time at DAPO was the only background variable that significantly predicted rehabilitation score – other variables such as race/ethnicity and gender were never significant.

Table 16: Regression results for attitude toward rehabilitation at follow-up (N=35)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immediate previous job of state corrections officer</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in DAPO</td>
<td>-0.46*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>32.06***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R-squared=0.20
\[ F (2, 32)=3.92^* \]
***p < .001; *p < .05

Attitudes toward rehabilitation – individual change over time

We next limited the analysis to include only those agents who completed baseline and follow-up surveys, rather than the entire baseline and follow-up groups, in order to look at change in attitudes of individual agents over time. The results are presented in Table 17.

There are two main findings concerning individual change in attitudes on the rehabilitation survey. First, the group mean score for agents who completed surveys at both points in time was 3.20 (SD = 0.76) at follow-up, compared with 3.25 (SD = 0.77) at
baseline, showing a very slight shift towards more rehabilitative attitudes over time. This is a reverse of the trend we observed in
the group change analysis, where the baseline group was slightly less punitive than the follow-up group as a whole. A possible
explanation for this finding is the suggestion made earlier that additional DAPO management personnel may have completed
baseline surveys, and as a consequence may have pushed the baseline mean score in the direction of rehabilitation. When we look
only at pilot site staff who completed both surveys, they did not show this tendency to become more punitive over time.

Table 17: Attitude toward rehabilitation for agents who completed both baseline and follow-up
surveys (N=31)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Follow-up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. All rehabilitation programs have done is to allow criminals who deserve to be punished to get off easily</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rehabilitating a criminal is just as important as making a criminal pay for his or her crime</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The most effective and humane cure to the crime problem in America is to make a strong effort to rehabilitate offenders</td>
<td>3.10*</td>
<td>2.55*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The only way to reduce crime in our society is to punish criminals, not try to rehabilitate them</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>5.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. We should stop viewing criminals as victims of society who deserve to be rehabilitated and start paying more attention to the victims of these criminals</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I would support expanding the rehabilitation programs with criminals that are now being undertaken in our prisons</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. One of the reasons why rehabilitation programs often fail with prisoners is because they are under-funded; if enough money were available, these programs would work</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The rehabilitation of adult criminals just does not work</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The rehabilitation of parolees has proven to be a failure</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a score of 1=strongly agree and 7=strongly disagree
Four participants were excluded due to missing data.
*p < .05

Secondly, again we observed a tendency for some survey questions to elicit slightly more punitive responses and some slightly
more rehabilitative. Table 17 shows that the first four questions all demonstrated a small shift towards attitudes more in favor
of rehabilitation, and the last four questions tended to shift towards more punitive attitudes (question 5 remained about the
same over time). To examine this trend, we split the survey into two parts. Part 1 contained questions 1-4, and Part 2 questions
6-9 (question 5, which remained stable over time, was removed from this analysis). When we looked at mean scores for these
two parts, we saw that agents became slightly less punitive from baseline to follow-up for Part 1 of the survey (3.1 at baseline
compared with 2.7 at follow-up), and slightly more punitive for Part 2 (3.0 at baseline compared with 3.3 at follow-up).

Since parole reform reduced agent caseloads, giving agents more time to concentrate on understanding a parolee’s criminogenic needs and how these risk factors may contribute to their offending behavior, we expected that agents may become more rehabilitative in their approach over time. Looking more closely at the questions that comprised the rehabilitation survey, the first four questions seemed to assess the general philosophy of rehabilitation, while the last four questions were more concerned with the effectiveness of current rehabilitation practices. A tentative conclusion from the analysis is that agents who experienced parole reform tended to become more positive over time in their views of rehabilitation generally, but less favorable about the value of rehabilitation practices currently in place in both institutions and the community. However, the overall lack of statistical significance shows that change in attitudes over time was relatively small.

‘Rehabilitative’ and ‘punitive’ groups from baseline to follow-up

Recall that we classified agents into ‘punitive’ and ‘rehabilitative’ groups for both the role and rehabilitation surveys at baseline,
based on scores that were plus or minus 0.5 SD from the mean. What happened to these groups of high and low agents at the
follow-up survey? Did agents classified as ‘rehabilitative’ remain that way over time, or did their attitudes shift toward a more
punitive outlook? Similarly, how many agents classified as ‘punitive’ at baseline were again classified as ‘punitive’ at follow-up?

We used the same 0.5 SD cut-off to classify the follow-up sample into ‘punitive’ or ‘rehabilitative’ groups; agents who were not
selected into one of these two groups were classified as ‘neutral’.
We consider results for the rehabilitation survey first, since we originally selected more agents into high/low groups for this survey at baseline. There were 15 agents in the ‘rehabilitative’ group at the baseline time period prior to parole reform. Of these, only six completed the follow-up survey. Of these six agents, five were again selected into the ‘rehabilitative’ group at follow-up, with the remaining agent selected into the ‘neutral’ group. This suggests that agents who were more likely to be rehabilitative in their outlook prior to parole reform were likely to remain consistent in their attitudes over time, and again be more rehabilitative than their peers five months later.

There were 17 agents in the ‘punitive’ group at baseline. Of these, 14 agents completed a follow-up survey. Seven of these 14 agents were again selected into the ‘punitive’ group at follow-up, showing consistently punitive attitudes over time. Five agents fell into the ‘neutral’ group at follow-up, showing that their punitive attitudes moderated somewhat over time and became less extreme. Two of the ‘punitive’ agents were selected into the ‘rehabilitative’ group at follow-up, demonstrating a dramatic shift from highly punitive prior to parole reform to highly rehabilitative views after reform was implemented.

The role survey had fewer agents selected into the high/low groups at baseline – seven in the ‘rehabilitative’ group and 12 in the ‘punitive’ group - which resulted in too few agents tracked through to follow-up for meaningful analysis (only three agents in the ‘rehabilitative’ group and seven in the ‘punitive’ group completed follow-up surveys).

Who ‘drank the Kool-Aid’?

Throughout the implementation process, DAPO executive staff have used the anecdotal term ‘drank the Kool-Aid’ to describe parole agents who have accepted the reform package and have been favorable in their response to the changes implemented. In this section, we looked at the background variables of agents who ‘drank the Kool-Aid’, that is, who changed their attitudes over time to become more rehabilitative in their approach, as expected under parole reform. Due to the small sample sizes involved, these results will be suggestive only and should be treated with caution.

There are various ways to slice the data in order to look at the question of who ‘drank the Kool-Aid’. If we are interested in how many agents became less punitive over time, then we would compare scores at follow-up to those at baseline to see whose scores went down over time. This analysis examines absolute change, without paying attention to an agent’s starting or finishing point, and is shown in the left panel of Figure 16. The second way of slicing the data looks at change over time but takes into account how punitive agents were to begin with. If agents were highly punitive at baseline they may have reduced their scores over time but still ended up as more punitive than their peers at follow-up. It is possible that agents showing the most dramatic absolute change were more punitive at baseline, since it would be easier for agents with extremely high initial scores to reduce them significantly over time relative to agents who commenced parole reform with ‘balanced’ views. This analysis is depicted in the middle panel of Figure 16, and examines the relative change of those agents who were more punitive than the mean at baseline. The final way to slice the data is to look just at the agents who ended up where DAPO wanted them to be, which was more rehabilitative on average than their peers at follow-up, regardless of where they were at baseline. This final analysis – shown in the right panel of Figure 16 – examines the characteristics of agents who scored below the mean at follow-up.

Figure 16: Three ways of examining agent change over time

![Figure 16: Three ways of examining agent change over time](image)

The attitudes toward rehabilitation survey

To provide a visual representation of the data, we plotted agents’ baseline and follow-up scores for the rehabilitation survey in Figure 17. Lines drawn in green with arrows pointing down reflect a drop in total score over time, with the filled circle showing the baseline score and the arrow-head the follow-up score (N=13). Red lines with arrows pointing up show where agents increased in punitiveness over time (N=14) or showed no change in attitude from baseline to follow-up (N=4).
We note three trends from Figure 17. First, agents in the early stages of their DAPO career (under five years) were likely to show dramatic change over time, most often in the direction of becoming less punitive, since there are more green than red lines. Second, there was a mid-career cluster of agents hovering around 10 years’ experience who tended to show less dramatic change over time. These agents were less punitive than their less experienced peers to start with, but they showed a tendency to become more punitive over time, since there are more red lines than green. Finally, we observed the trend we noted earlier, which is that as experience increased, scores tended to get lower.

**Absolute change.** To examine the first question of absolute change, we were interested in the characteristics of agents who had long green lines, demonstrating a significant downward shift in attitudes over time. We defined ‘significant’ as a two-point or more reduction in total score over time. Thirteen agents met this criterion. We then compared the background variables of this sub-set of agents (the ‘Kool-Aid’ agents) with the follow-up sample as a whole to see if there were any obvious background factors associated with reduced scores. There did not appear to be a gender effect - there were as many females in the ‘Kool-Aid’ group as in the follow-up sample generally. The same can be said for education level, with about 60% of both the ‘Kool-Aid’ and follow-up samples comprised of agents with a four-year degree or higher. Race/ethnicity also was not heavily over- or under-represented in the ‘Kool-Aid’ group – there were three White, three Black, five Latino/Hispanic and two other/multiracial agents, which is roughly what we'd expect looking at the demographics of the follow-up sample as a whole. The last variable we looked at was immediate prior job as a corrections officer, which again showed no obvious association with a reduction in scores over time.

Next we looked at whether any background characteristics were associated with significant *increases* in scores over time. Eleven agents met the criterion of increasing their scores by two points or more over time. With such small numbers it is difficult to draw conclusions, but race/ethnicity, gender and education level all appeared to be represented among these 11 agents in a manner that would be expected by their frequency of occurrence in the follow-up sample generally. One interesting finding was that only two of the agents who became more punitive over time were corrections officers in their job immediately prior to DAPO – based on their representation in the sample generally we would have expected to see four or five.

**Relative change.** The next question concerned *relative* change over time, taking into account not just whether agents changed over time, but whether they were more or less punitive than their peers to start with. There were 23 agents below the mean on the rehabilitation survey at baseline (i.e., less punitive than their peers prior to parole reform) and 26 agents who were above
the mean (i.e., more punitive than their peers at baseline). We calculated agents’ change scores by subtracting their baseline from their follow-up score. Recalling that higher scores reflect more punitive views, if an agent’s score increased from baseline to follow-up then they became more punitive over time, and their change score would be a positive number. Consequently, in the change charts we present below higher numbers indicate agents who became more punitive over time. Conversely, if an agent became more rehabilitative over time their score would decrease, and subtracting their first (higher) score from their second (lower) score would result in a negative number. On the charts below, points below the mid-point indicate agents who became less punitive over time. Scores of zero would mean an agent showed no change over time. In Figure 18 we plot change scores by DAPO length of service for the follow-up sample (N=31) according to agents’ scores on the baseline survey. In the left panel we present agents who were more punitive than their peers at baseline, and on the right are agents who were less punitive. Data points along the zero line show agents who did not change their score over time; data points below the zero mid-point reflect agents who became less punitive over time; points above zero represent agents who became more punitive over time.

**Figure 18: Rehabilitation change score by time worked at DAPO for agents more/less punitive than the mean at baseline**

Looking first at the left panel, one counts 20 data points for agents who were more punitive than their peers at baseline and who completed a follow-up survey. Of these, two agents showed no attitudinal change over time and thus had a change score of zero. Ten agents became more rehabilitative over time and are mostly clustered in the lower left quadrant, indicating that they were likely to have fewer than five years with DAPO. Eight agents became even more even punitive over time; these agents were spread more evenly in terms of their years with DAPO. To summarize, many less experienced agents were more punitive than their peers prior to parole reform but showed dramatic changes in attitude during the CPSRM pilot, mostly, but not always, in the direction DAPO wanted. On the other hand, if an agent started out with a relatively punitive attitude and had more than about seven years with DAPO, then they never ‘drank the Kool-Aid’ to become less punitive over time.

The right panel shows data for the 11 agents who were more rehabilitative than their peers prior to parole reform and who completed a follow-up survey. Of these, two agents had the same score at follow-up as baseline and thus had a change score of zero. Three agents, all with more than 10 years with DAPO, became even more rehabilitative over time, and six agents showed attitudinal change in the opposite direction (became more punitive over time).

The slope of the regression lines in Figure 18 can be used to summarize the trend. We observed earlier that agents with more years’ experience had lower scores on the rehabilitation survey, indicating they placed a higher value on rehabilitation than did recent DAPO hires. However, when we consider only those agents who were punitive to begin with, then agents with fewer years’ experience were more likely than veteran agents to ‘improve’ their scores over time. This suggests that although veteran agents may be more receptive to parole reform to begin with, when veteran agents are punitive in their attitudes they may be more difficult to change than less experienced agents.

Below the mean. There were only 14 agents with scores below the mean at follow-up, which is too few for meaningful analysis. Comparing the composition of agents in this group with the follow-up sample generally, we notice the same trends as
previously observed: agents who were more rehabilitative at follow-up compared with their peers had a tendency to be Black (43% compared with 31% for the follow-up sample), hold a graduate degree (29% compared with 11%), have more than ten years of experience with DAPO (57% compared with 39%) and not have been a state corrections officer immediately prior to joining DAPO (29% compared with 42%).

The attitudes toward role survey

We followed the same procedure for the attitude toward role scale, first plotting agents’ baseline and follow-up scores (see Figure 19). Again, green lines show a drop in total score over time where agents became less punitive toward their role (N=16) and red lines show where agents increased in punitiveness over time (N=8) or showed no change in attitude from baseline to follow-up (N=4).

Figure 19: A visual representation of change in scores on the role survey over time

Consistent with our finding presented earlier (Figure 13 on p. 33) there was no relationship between length of DAPO service and attitude toward role – one can visualize a ‘flat line’ across Figure 19 (as opposed to the downward slope evident in Figure 17 for the rehabilitation survey). There were twice as many green lines as red (ignoring horizontal lines indicating no change over time); many agents got more rehabilitative in their role over time, and some did so quite dramatically.

Absolute change. First, looking at absolute change, 12 agents showed a decrease in their score of two points or more over time. Was there anything distinctive in the backgrounds of these agents that set them apart from the follow-up sample as a whole? The answer was no – three of them were female, four had an immediate previous job as a corrections officer, eight had four or more years of college, and all races were represented in roughly the same proportions as we would expect, so there was nothing remarkable about the backgrounds of these 12 agents that obviously distinguished them from their peers. With only five agents showing significant change in the opposite (more punitive) direction we were unable to look at the background characteristics of these individuals in a meaningful way.

Relative change. Looking at relative change over time, the left panel of Figure 20 shows the change scores for the 14 agents who were more punitive than their peers on the role survey at baseline. Most of these agents (N=11) demonstrated a shift towards a more rehabilitative view of their role over time. Only three agents increased their score over time, becoming even more
punitive concerning their role. The right panel shows the 14 agents who scored below the mean on the role survey at baseline and who completed a follow-up survey. Of these, many showed only slight fluctuation at follow-up, hovering on or about the zero line. Only four agents showed fluctuation of five points or more; two of these became even less punitive over time, and two shifted in the opposite direction.

**Figure 20: Role change score by time worked at DAPO for agents more/less punitive than the mean at baseline**

Below the mean. There were only 14 agents who were below the mean on the role survey at follow-up, which limited our ability to compare proportions of background factors. We observed that agents in this group had a slight tendency, compared with the follow-up sample generally, to be female (43% compared with 36%), Black (43% compared with 31%), have four or more years of college (64% compared with 58%) and to not have been a corrections officers in their immediate prior job (29% compared with 42%).

**9. CONCLUSIONS**

This section will discuss findings from the follow-up surveys, commenting on change in attitudes over time, and should be considered in conjunction with conclusions from the baseline surveys presented on page 27.

Our findings from the survey component of the CEBC process evaluation were that:

1. Agents recognized a slight (but overall non-significant) shift in their role during the course of the CPSRM pilot implementation toward an orientation that emphasized the social work function of the parole agent role. This change in attitudes toward their role was small – an average reduction in total survey score of only 1.5 points – but was consistent across survey items and was particularly evident (and reached statistical significance) when agents were asked about the competing social work – law enforcement functions of their role.

2. When we restricted our analysis to look only at agents who completed both surveys (i.e., baseline and follow-up) agents became slightly (but not significantly) less punitive over time in their general attitudes toward rehabilitation. However, when we looked at the full follow-up sample as a group compared to the baseline sample, this trend towards a positive change in attitude was observed only for survey questions that assessed the general philosophy of rehabilitation as a response to crime. When survey questions probed current rehabilitation practices, agents at follow-up were more slightly punitive in their views than at baseline. There are two possible explanations for this finding. The first explanation is that a small number of additional DAPO management staff were present at the initial training session and completed baseline surveys, contributing to a mean score that was artificially low (more rehabilitative in its outlook) that corrected itself when follow-up surveys were done and these staff were not present. The sample size (N=51) collected at baseline suggests that this may be the case. Another explanation is that agents became more attuned to rehabilitation practices during the CPSRM pilot, and perhaps more cynical about their value, and hence did experience a slightly negative shift in attitude regarding the rehabilitation programs currently available. Parole agent interviews
conducted as a separate component of the CEBC process evaluation found that the majority of agents (73%) thought there was not enough programming available. It is likely that the emphasis placed on identifying and addressing criminogenic needs introduced with parole reform may have made agents more aware of the lack of programming resources available for parolees, and hence more cynical in their views regarding the value of rehabilitation.

3. Female agents displayed a tendency to view their role in a more rehabilitative light than did male agents, both prior to the pilot implementation and at follow-up. However, gender did not have a significant effect on attitude toward rehabilitation, only attitude toward role. This finding is consistent with previous research.

4. Veteran agents with more years of experience as a parole agent were significantly less punitive in their attitude toward rehabilitation than agents with fewer years’ experience, both at baseline and at follow-up. Again, this finding is consistent with previous research showing that older, more experienced agents may be more comfortable in their roles. It could be that agents recruited some time ago differ in their attitudes from agents recruited recently. Another possible explanation is that veteran agents have ‘seen it all’ and have become more rehabilitative in their views over time. Although agents with less than five years at DAPO were generally more punitive prior to parole reform, many of these agents demonstrated a dramatic shift in attitude over time, becoming much less punitive. The same cannot be said for veteran agents – the few experienced agents who were more punitive than their peers to begin with never ‘drank the Kool-Aid’ to become more rehabilitative in their approach over time.

5. Agents who had transitioned to DAPO immediately from a career as a corrections officer were different from those who had joined DAPO from a different career path. With corrections officer as an immediate job background, agents were significantly more punitive in their attitude toward rehabilitation (but not their role) prior to the CPSRM pilot. These agents displayed a tendency to be more punitive on both the role and rehabilitation surveys at follow-up, although this effect was not statistically significant, probably due to the small sample size involved.

6. Although we sliced the data several ways, there were no other consistent relationships between other agent background characteristics – such as race/ethnicity and education – and change in attitudes over time once other factors were controlled for.

10. FURTHER RESEARCH

The parole agent surveys represent one component of the CPSRM process evaluation currently being undertaken by CEBC. We have disseminated findings from parole agent interviews we conducted earlier this year to gather feedback about agent and supervisor perceptions of the pilot implementation. We are currently analyzing data from a behavioral study examining the communication patterns of pilot site agents during office contacts with parolees, which specifically measures the use of motivational interviewing techniques and discussion about criminogenic needs during agent-parolee interactions. This behavioral study will be important in demonstrating whether agent style of supervision - as opposed to agent attitudes - has changed under parole reform. At the request of DAPO, we are also planning interviews with parolees to gather data on how parolees view supervision practices under the CPSRM model.

Ultimately, the success of CPSRM depends upon changing the way parole agents go about the business of supervision and demonstrating that these new practices result in improved public safety. Later in 2011, CEBC will begin an outcome evaluation examining rates of recidivism at CPSRM pilot sites. It will be important to link any observed changes in recidivism to measured changes in parole agent supervision practices during the pilot implementation. The process evaluation, part of which is presented in this report, aims to get inside the ‘black box’ of supervision at CPSRM pilot sites in order to quantify changes to parole supervision under the new model. This understanding will assist in determining the effectiveness of parole reform.
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APPENDIX A – DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS

1. Your date of birth (to match Survey Parts 1 and 2)   /   /  
   Mo Day Year

2. Your gender (circle)   M    F

3. Your ethnicity/race (check all that apply)
   ___White/Anglo
   ___Black/African American
   ___Latino/Hispanic
   ___Asian
   ___Other:_____________________

4. Your education (check one)
   ___Less than high school
   ___High school
   ___Some college
   ___60 units or more but no degree
   ___Completed a 2-year college degree
   ___Completed a 4-year college degree
   ___Completed a graduate degree

5. Major area of study
   ___Social work
   ___Sociology/psychology
   ___Criminal justice/criminology
   ___Law or other social sciences
   ___Education, humanities
   ___Other:_____________________

6. Prior work experience (check all that apply)
   ___Social casework/welfare
   ___Probation, juvenile
   ___Probation, adult
   ___Law enforcement
   ___State corrections: counselor
   ___State corrections: officer
   ___Other:_____________________

7. What job did you have immediately prior to joining the parole division?
   ___ Social casework/welfare
   ___ Probation, juvenile
   ___ Probation, adult
   ___ Law enforcement
   ___ State corrections: counselor
   ___ State corrections: officer
   ___ Other: ____________________

8. How long have you worked for California parole (DAPO)?
   ___ Years ___ months

9. How long have you worked for CDCR?
   ___ Years ___ months

10. How long have you worked for corrections (TOTAL time in California plus time in other jurisdictions outside of California)?
    ___ Years ___ months
APPENDIX B – PAROLE AGENT ATTITUDES TOWARD ROLE SURVEY

For each question, please circle the number that best applies to you.

1. As a parole agent, your primary obligation is to
Rehabilitate the offender   1  2  3  4  5  6   Enforce supervisory conditions

2. Your primary concern as a parole agent is to
Monitor offender compliance  1  2  3  4  5  6   Rehabilitate the offender

3. Which best describes your role as a parole agent
Police officer   1  2  3  4  5  6   Social worker

4. Your most appropriate role with offenders is as
Advocate   1  2  3  4  5  6   Supervisor

5. The most essential part of a parole agent’s job is
Counseling   1  2  3  4  5  6   Enforcing

6. Your primary function as an agent is
Enforcement   1  2  3  4  5  6   Intervention

7. Your function as a parole agent most clearly approximates
Law enforcement   1  2  3  4  5  6   Social work
Please answer the questions using the following scale (circle your answer).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All rehabilitation programs have done is to allow criminals who deserve to be punished to get off easily.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitating a criminal is just as important as making a criminal pay for his or her crime.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The most effective and humane cure to the crime problem in America is to make a strong effort to rehabilitate offenders.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The only way to reduce crime in our society is to punish criminals, not to try to rehabilitate them.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We should stop viewing criminals as victims of society who deserve to be rehabilitated and start paying more attention to the victims of these criminals.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would support expanding the rehabilitation programs with criminals that are now being undertaken in our prisons.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of the reasons why rehabilitation programs often fail with prisoners is because they are under-funded; if enough money were available, these programs would work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The rehabilitation of adult criminals just does not work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The rehabilitation of parolees has proven to be a failure.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D – KNOWLEDGE SURVEY

1. Your date of birth (to match Survey Parts 1 and 2)   /   /   

   Mo  Day  Year

Knowledge survey

1. According to California Department of Corrections & Rehabilitation, Division of Adult Parole Operation (DAPO) the criteria for high needs referrals are:
   a. The parolee is physically and developmentally disabled
   b. The parolee is CCCMS
   c. The parolee is 65 years or older and homeless
   d. The parolee is required to register per PC 290 and homeless
   e. All the above

2. Penal Code Section 3000.03 defines and sets forth which of the following:
   a. Registration requirements for interstate sex offender cases
   b. Registration requirements for civil commitments
   c. Non revocable parole
   d. Inmates released per Penal Code Section 3060.7

3. Which of the following term(s) are not criminogenic need(s)?
   a. Pro-social values
   b. Illiteracy
   c. Substance abuse
   d. Employment
   e. Criminal peer association

4. California Department of Corrections & Rehabilitation, Division of Adult Parole Operation (DAPO) defines parolees with the highest risk control as:
   a. Any validated or non-validated gang member
   b. A parolee with a California Static Risk Assessment (CSRA) score of 3 or less
   c. A parolee that is required to register per Health and Safety Code section 11590
   d. A parolee with a California Static Risk Assessment (CSRA) score of 4 or less
   e. A parolee with a California Static Risk Assessment score of 5 or is required to register per Penal Code Sections 290 through 290.023

5. The following are the new the supervision categories except:
   a. Transition phase
   b. Category A
   c. Category B
   d. Category F
   e. Category C
f. Specialized Global Positioning System (GPS)  
g. Enhanced Outpatient Program (EOP) Participant  
h. Category D  

6. Motivational Interviewing (MI) is a system of communication in which the parolee creates reasons for change. The terms listed below are the four basic principles of MI except:  
a. Express Empathy  
b. Developing Discrepancy  
c. Roll With Resistance  
d. Breaking Down Barriers  
e. Support Self Efficacy  

7. The Six Dynamic Risk Factors are also known as:  
a. Behavioral modification tools  
b. Stages of change  
c. Criminogenic needs  
d. Forward focused questions  
e. Supervision categories  

8. What is the exclusionary criteria for the Electronic In-Home Detention Program?  
a. Any parolee supervised under the Interstate Compact  
b. Civil Commitments  
c. Parolees that must register under Health and Safety Code Section 11590  
d. Parolees being supervised with Global Positioning Technology  
e. Any parolee who has a documented allergy to latex  

9. A parolee that is identified as a “court walkover and/or a paper commitment” will be initially assigned to what category of supervision?  
a. Category A  
b. Category B  
c. Category E  
d. Transition Phase  

10. What best defines a level I incentive of the Rewards and Incentives Program?  
a. A certificate of accomplishment presented by the Parole Agent  
b. A modification of conditions of parole  
c. Verbal recognition by the Parole Agent  
d. A travel pass  
a. Early discharge consideration
11. The Rewards and Incentive Program consists of how many levels?
   a. 5
   b. 3
   c. 6
   d. 4

12. Parole Placement and Planning staff will generate a Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions (COMPAS) assessment for all new commitments and Parole Violators with a new term except:
   a. Parole Violators with a new term required to register per Penal Code Section 290
   b. Inmates released per Penal Code Section 3060.7
   c. Inmates released from Federal Institutions
   d. Inmates released pursuant to Penal Code Section 3003.05
   e. Inmates released pursuant to Penal Code Section 3000.03

13. The Agent of Record will physically verify the proposed residence of record no later than ____ calendar days prior to release.
   a. 15
   b. 45
   c. 30
   d. 60
   e. 120