

WPI

Federal Probation

Choosing the Future of American Corrections: Punishment or Reform? *James Byrne*
Mary Brewster

The Impact of Critical Incident Stress: Is Your Office Prepared to Respond? *Mark Maggio*
Elaine Terenzi

Probation Officer Safety and Mental Conditioning *Paul W. Brown*

Federal Detention: The United States Marshals Service's Management of a Challenging Program *Linda S. Caudell-Feagan*

Total Quality Management: Can It Work in Federal Probation? *Richard W. Janes*

College Education in Prisons: The Inmates' Perspectives *Ahmad Tootoonchi*

to Women's Prisons in California: An Exploratory Study *Lisa G. Fuller*

oes of Juvenile Restitution Programs in Two Midwestern ties: A Comparative Study *Sudipto Roy*

turing Justice in Russia: A New Era of Challenges *G. Frederick Allen*

t the Future—Carving Out New Territory for American ections *J. Michael Quinlan*

146958-
0996971
146966

DECEMBER 1993

146958-
146966

**U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice**

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

Federal Probation

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

Federal Probation

A JOURNAL OF CORRECTIONAL PHILOSOPHY AND PRACTICE

Published by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts

VOLUME LVII

DECEMBER 1993

NUMBER 4

This Issue in Brief

ACQUISITIONS

Choosing the Future of American Corrections: Punishment or Reform?—What does the future hold for criminal justice and corrections in this country? Authors James Byrne and Mary Brewster examine the four most important predictions of John DiIulio, Princeton University professor and author of *No Escape—The Future of American Corrections*, and offer some suggestions to those state and local corrections policy-makers who believe the United States is moving in the wrong direction.

The Impact of Critical Incident Stress: Is Your Office Prepared to Respond?—Physical assault of an officer while on duty, unexpected death of a co-worker, a natural disaster—all can be considered critical incidents which affect not only the individuals involved but the organization as a whole. Authors Mark Maggio and Elaine Terenzi define critical incidents, explain the importance of providing stress education before such crises occur, and offer suggestions as to what administrator and managers can do to respond effectively and maintain a healthy and productive workforce.

Probation Officer Safety and Mental Conditioning.—Author Paul W. Brown discusses mental conditioning as a component of officer safety that is all too often overlooked or minimized in training programs. He focuses on five areas of mental conditioning: the color code of awareness, crisis rehearsal, the continuum of force, kinesics, and positive self-talk.

Federal Detention: The United States Marshals Service's Management of a Challenging Program.—Focusing on the detention of Federal prisoners, author Linda S. Caudell-Feagan discusses the work of the United States Marshals Service. She explains how detention beds are acquired, how the Marshals Service administers funds to pay the costs of housing Federal detainees, what the ramifications of increased detention costs are, and what actions the Marshals Service has taken to address detention problems.

Total Quality Management: Can It Work in Federal Probation?—Author Richard W. Janes outlines the principles of total quality management and their

application to Federal probation work. The article is based not only on a review of the literature but also on the author's experience in a Federal probation agency where these concepts are being implemented.

College Education in Prisons: The Inmates' Perspectives.—Author Ahmad Tootoonchi reports on a study to determine the impact of college education on the attitudes of inmates toward life and their future. The results reveal that a significant number of the inmates surveyed believe that their behavior can change for the better through college education.

Visitors to Women's Prisons in California: An Exploratory Study.—Author Lisa G. Fuller describes a study which focuses on visitors to California's three state women's prisons. The study, designed to

CONTENTS

Choosing the Future of American Corrections: Punishment or Reform?	146958	James Byrne Mary Brewster	3
The Impact of Critical Incident Stress: Is Your Office Prepared to Respond?	146959	Mark Maggio Elaine Terenzi	10
Probation Officer Safety and Mental Conditioning	146960	Paul W. Brown	17
Federal Detention: The United States Marshals Service's Management of a Challenging Program	146961	Linda S. Caudell-Feagan	22
Total Quality Management: Can It Work in Federal Probation?	146962	Richard W. Janes	28
College Education in Prisons: The Inmates' Perspectives	146963	Ahmad Tootoonchi	34
Visitors to Women's Prisons in California: An Exploratory Study	146964	Lisa G. Fuller	41
Two Types of Juvenile Restitution Programs in Two Midwestern Counties: A Comparative Study	146965	Sudipto Roy	48
Restructuring Justice in Russia: A New Era of Challenges	146966	G. Frederick Allen	54
Departments			
News of the Future			59
Reviews of Professional Periodicals			64
Your Bookshelf on Review			75
It Has Come to Our Attention			83
Indexes of Articles and Book Reviews			85

Choosing the Future of American Corrections: Punishment or Reform?

BY JAMES BYRNE AND MARY BREWSTER*

Introduction

IT MAY appear paradoxical, but perhaps the best way to begin an assessment of the future of American corrections is to review briefly our recent past. The pendulum of U.S. correctional reform has swung back and forth over the past 150 years, reflecting the public's frustration with both liberal and conservative criminal justice policies. Rutgers University professor Jim Finckenauer (1982) has observed that the history of corrections in this country is a history of failed panaceas, i.e., correctional programs that promised far more "crime control" than they could possibly deliver. In the wake of such visible program failures, government officials have invariably moved to change their philosophy of offender control. For example, in the 1960's and 1970's in this country, "crime control through treatment" was the prevailing philosophy of corrections. In the name of treatment, a number of institutional and community-based rehabilitation programs were designed, implemented, and evaluated. When the results of these evaluations suggested that "nothing worked" in the area of offender rehabilitation (e.g., Lipton, Martinson, & Wilks, 1975), policymakers quickly shifted their focus and developed a rationale for a corrections system that was based on a classical school philosophy of "crime control through punishment." The pendulum had swung in a new, more conservative direction.

During the 1980's, Federal, state, and local legislators and correctional administrators declared "war" on drug users, sex offenders, drunk drivers, and a range of other specific offender groups selected for the "crime of the month" club (e.g., carjackings in Washington, DC, hate crimes in Massachusetts). We arrested, prosecuted, convicted, and incarcerated offenders for these crimes at much higher levels than ever before in our history, resulting in record increases in prison and jail populations, correctional crowding, and correctional costs by the end of the decade (see, e.g., Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1993; Edna McConnell Clark Foundation, 1992). We also applied this strategy of crime control through punishment to the community corrections population by introducing a new wave of "get tough" surveillance-oriented community corrections programs designed to provide the punishment/control features of incarceration in a community-based setting. Unfortunately, neither insti-

tution nor community-based sanctions have had the impact on offenders that policymakers and program developers had predicted; in fact, many observers have argued that we have made matters worse (Byrne, Lurigio, & Petersilia, 1992). The pendulum of correctional reform is now poised to swing once again.

The dilemma for legislators and correctional administrators is that they must address the immediate problems caused by their reliance on incarceration and surveillance-oriented community control during the past decade (e.g., increased costs, crowding, and control problems), while developing a long-term vision for the future of Federal, state, and local correctional programs. As they devise their short- and long-term strategies, these officials will struggle with a difficult, but critical, correctional policy issue: how should we weigh the relative importance of our desire for offense-based punishment and our need for individual offender reform?

Inevitably, both short- and long-term corrections strategies will be based not only on an assessment of past experiences but also on predictions of the future: Will crime and victimization rates increase in this decade? Will arrest trends change for various types of crime? Will we prosecute, convict, and sentence offenders in the same manner? And, most importantly to corrections policymakers and practitioners, will our institutional and community-based corrections populations continue to grow, requiring even more resources than they do today? After considering these basic questions, John DiIulio, a professor of politics and public affairs at Princeton University, has offered a number of predictions about the future of criminal justice and corrections in this country. We examine DiIulio's four most important predictions in this article and then offer some suggestions to those state and local policymakers who believe the U.S. is moving in the wrong direction, based on a misguided philosophy of corrections.

A Pessimistic View of the Future of Corrections

In 1991, John DiIulio wrote *No Escape—The Future of American Corrections*, in which he offers a fairly bleak assessment of the future of corrections in this country, based in large part on the notion that our recent past is probably the best predictor of our immediate future. DiIulio's analysis includes his review of research on demographic trends (in particular the size of the young adult population) and changes in the

*Dr. Byrne is professor, Department of Criminal Justice, University of Massachusetts Lowell. Dr. Brewster is assistant professor, Department of Criminal Justice, West Chester University.

criminal justice processing of various groups of offenders (in particular, drug offenders, property offenders, mentally ill offenders, and drunk drivers).

DiIulio offers four predictions about the future of corrections in this country. First, he argues that there is no escape from the future of a much larger correctional system. Two years ago, DiIulio made the prediction that during the 1990's the number of citizens in prison and jail and in various community-based corrections programs will greatly increase. "By the year 2000 . . . the total number of citizens in the charge of corrections officials will easily surpass 4 million" (DiIulio, 1991, pp. 3-4). Since we have *already* surpassed this point, it appears that—barring a sudden shift in sentencing practices—DiIulio's prediction may actually be too conservative. This expected increase in overall correctional population at the end of the century is not surprising; it is an inevitable consequence of the size of the "at risk" adult population.

According to a recent report, *Americans Behind Bars*, released by the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation (1992, p. 7), "Over 60 percent of the people who were arrested and charged for crimes in 1991 . . . were between the ages of 13 and 29." As the children of the "baby boom" generation (the echo boomers) move through that "high risk" period during the mid/late 1990's, crime rates are likely to rise. The effects of this increase will be noticed *throughout* the criminal justice system. Unless there is a dramatic shift in policy and practice, larger correctional populations should be anticipated. How *much* larger? Based on our own review of state-level prison population projections included in the *1992 Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics* (Maguire, Pastore, & Flanagan, 1993, pp. 619-621), the state prison population will reach 924,824 by the end of 1993, rise to 1,073,064 in 1995, and peak at 1,166,268 in the year 2000. Increases of similar proportions can be anticipated for the jail, probation, and parole populations.

The second prediction DiIulio makes is that there is no escape from the need for more prison and jail space because "we are already working near the limits of our capacity to manage offenders in the community" (DiIulio, 1991, p. 5). The United States spent an estimated \$25 billion on corrections in 1992, and in 1993, a total of 120,207 additional beds will be added to the Federal and state prison systems (Edna McConnell Clark Foundation, 1992). Despite these expenditures the institutional system remains crowded beyond capacity, while the community-based system is actually in worse shape. DiIulio has correctly observed that because the community corrections system is *more* crowded than our institutional system, it currently does not have the resources necessary to adequately supervise those offenders who are being sent to prison

or jail. Rather than suggest that policymakers might want to reevaluate how they slice the correctional resource "pie," DiIulio has resigned himself to the need for a larger institutional system.

DiIulio's third prediction is that there is no escape from a future of institutional overcrowding because supply (i.e., prison/jail space, construction) always seems to lag behind demand (i.e., offenders sentenced to a period of incarceration). A recent nationwide review of construction plans developed by state corrections agencies underscores this point: only 14 of the 44 states who responded to the survey felt that current construction plans were adequate, given prison population projections for the next several years (see Maguire, Pastore, & Flanagan, 1993, pp. 619-621). Along with crowding will come "[a] rise in . . . violence behind bars, as well as . . . deterioration in the quantity and quality of . . . educational and work opportunities available to inmates" (DiIulio, 1991, p. 5). In other words, we will *not* build our way out of our current crowding crisis, and as a result many offenders will leave our prison system in worse shape than when they arrived. DiIulio argues that it may be possible to lessen the negative consequences of crowding through better management, but the scenario he presents is quite bleak.

The last prediction offered by DiIulio is that there is no escape from the need to look much more closely at the area of community-based corrections and to identify those programs that may indeed have a recidivism reduction effect. DiIulio identifies three "promising alternatives" to incarceration: house arrest with electronic monitoring, community service sentences, and intensive supervision programs. Although these programs may have been first sold to the public based on their "get tough" surveillance orientation, there is mounting evidence that it is the *rehabilitative* components of these programs that achieve the desired recidivism reduction effects (Byrne & Pattavina, 1992). Perhaps unwittingly, DiIulio appears to be predicting a "comeback" for an old panacea—community-based offender rehabilitation programs. This is interesting because if DiIulio's assessment is correct, it portends a major change in correctional policy in this country: a "rediscovery" of correctional rehabilitation. Despite (or perhaps because of) DiIulio's generally gloomy predictions about the need to expand our capacity to incarcerate, he argues that the only hope for the future is to solve this problem by looking at promising alternatives to incarceration and determining what types of programs do and do not seem to work in terms of changing offenders. In this regard, DiIulio contends that social science research has yet to provide answers to precisely the kinds of questions that Federal, state, and local policymakers and practitioners need to ask:

What works? With whom? And why? However, a number of recent reviews of the research on the newest wave of community corrections programs (e.g., boot camps, intensive supervision, house arrest, community service sentences) have focused on precisely these questions (Byrne, Lurigio, & Petersilia, 1992; Palmer, 1992), and as a result a consensus seems to be forming regarding both the effectiveness of programs focusing on offender rehabilitation and the *ineffectiveness* of surveillance-oriented community corrections programs.

Is DiIulio correct in each of his four "inescapable" predictions about the future of American corrections? While each of DiIulio's predictions seems plausible, he may or may not be correct, based on what we do—in the area of sentencing and corrections—over the next 2 to 3 years. As legislators and correctional administrators at the Federal, state, and local levels develop new initiatives, they will shape the future of corrections in this country. The question is: how will they answer basic questions about the *purpose* of corrections as they rethink their response to the various types of offenders, such as drug and alcohol offenders, mentally ill offenders, and property offenders? To answer this question, legislators and correctional administrators need to consider the four basic purposes of any sanction: (1) punishment/retribution, (2) deterrence, (3) rehabilitation, and (4) control. The key to understanding where our correctional system is headed is to determine how these various aims are prioritized by policymakers at the Federal, state, and local levels.

The Punishment of Offenders

In any assessment of current and future correctional policy, the first topic to consider is the definition of punishment. The punishment dimension of sentencing policy is essential to the future direction of the system. If we keep going in terms of present incarceration trends, obviously, with the echo boom generation coming of age and changing demographics (e.g., size of the minority poor population), we suspect that DiIulio will be correct in his predictions regarding the size and capacity of the institutional system. For a variety of reasons, policymakers invariably equate incapacitation with punishment. However, now is a good time to reassess the effectiveness of our "punishment by incapacitation" strategy, particularly in our use of incarceration for property offenders, drunk drivers, drug users, small-time drug dealers, and mentally ill offenders. As a number of corrections experts have observed, there are *other* ways to punish offenders than to lock them up for a period of time (e.g., Austin & Irwin, 1993).

How can punishment be redefined? One strategy that is gaining national attention involves the calculation of "exchange rates" for institution and community-based sanctions. Such a strategy would effectively switch the focus away from *where* the punishment is imposed and toward *what* the appropriate punishment entails (Morris & Tonry, 1990; von Hirsch, 1992). Stated simply, the term "exchange rate" refers to the number of days under various forms of community supervision that would be equal to a single day of incarceration. For example, a sentencing guideline commission might decide that the exchange rate for house arrest might be 3:1 (3 days under house arrest equal 1 day of incarceration). Policymakers in a number of states are now thinking about how to redefine punishment and exchange a period of incarceration for a period of supervision in the community. This area of sentencing, i.e., how we define punishment in terms of both incarceration and nonincarceration sanctions, will come down to this notion of exchange: how we build it into existing sentencing guidelines and how we decide on the value of a period of time in the community in exchange for a period of incarceration. We suspect that similar changes will be proposed regarding the mandatory sentencing laws currently used/found in 46 states. For example, a mandatory 1-year prison sentence might be "exchanged" for 3 years under intensive supervision in the community, based on the belief that these two sanctions offer an equivalent level of punishment.

Any assessment of "just" and/or appropriate punishment depends on how we define punishment in terms of various corrections sanctions. Do we define punishment exclusively in terms of the stigma associated with a conviction status and/or sentence location and length? Or, do we also view lifestyle restrictions, community service, loss of income due to fines, or some sort of community work project as forms of punishment? And given our definition of punishment in a community setting, how do we define what the exchange rate with incarceration in a prison or jail will be? Answers to these questions will determine the movement towards nonincarceration sanctions in states across the country.

Deterrence

We certainly sentence offenders to prison, jail, and various community-based sanctions (including fines, community service, probation, and intermediate sanctions) to *punish* them. But punishment is only *one* of the aims of sentencing. We also hope to deter both the convicted offender (specific deterrence) and the public at large (general deterrence) from committing crime in the future. To many, the best way to deter—both specifically and generally—is to punish the convicted

offender by locking him or her up for a period of time. Incarceration is supposed to act as a "warning" to *potential* offenders and as a lesson to *actual* offenders. Between 1980 and 1992, the size of the state and Federal prison populations in the United States increased 267.9 percent, from 329,821 to 883,593 offenders. Our reliance on incarceration does not appear to be abating. For example, only five states reported that their prison populations actually decreased in 1992. These states were Maine, New Jersey, North Dakota, Oregon, and Wyoming. Prison populations rose in the remaining states, with Texas (18.4 percent increase), West Virginia (16.2 percent), New Hampshire (15.9 percent), Idaho (15.5 percent), and Wisconsin (15.4 percent) reporting the largest increases between 1991 and 1992 (see *Bureau of Justice Statistics*, 1993).

How effective is this strategy of deterrence by incapacitation? The *overall* crime and victimization rates were relatively stable over the past decade, which suggests that our increased reliance on incarceration did *not* have the direct general deterrent effect on crime that many conservative policymakers had suggested (Steffensmeier & Harer, 1993; Byrne, Lurigio, & Petersilia, 1992). In terms of the *specific* deterrent effects of incarceration on offenders, research suggests that a period of time in prison/jail actually *increases* the risk of subsequent offending once these individuals are released to the community (Byrne & Kelly, 1989). In short, a strong case can certainly be made for the need for prisons and jails to fulfill the *retributive* aims of sentencing; however, legislators and correctional administrators will find little or no support for their claims that *incarceration* deters current and potential offenders. Given the rising costs of institutional corrections in this country—it is the second fastest growing area in state budgets after Medicaid (Edna McConnell Clark Foundation, 1992)—it is not surprising that pressure has been mounting at the state and local levels to justify the *benefit* of new prison/jail construction and to consider community-based alternatives.

Of course, deterrence-based assumptions have also been used to develop community corrections programs. In the community corrections area, the idea that we can use the surveillance features of programs to deter offenders from future criminal behavior has been tried for several years. However, the evidence is in from the 1980's get-tough surveillance-oriented community supervision programs, such as boot camps, intensive supervision, home detention, and day reporting centers. Overall, surveillance-oriented intermediate sanctions programs have not been found to reduce cost, they have not been found to reduce overcrowding, and, most importantly, they have not been found to have major recidivism reduction effects (see

Byrne, Lurigio, & Petersilia, 1992). These results are likely to depress people who are in favor of getting people out of prison and who feel that "get tough" community sanctions offer one way to do it. But if specific deterrence is an important goal of sentencing, surveillance-oriented community sanctions are not the route to take.

Faced with the media reports of ineffective programs, we think that policymakers and program managers are going to move away from these surveillance-oriented programs because we do not have the evidence that they have the desired effect. Thus, any predictions about the *future* direction of American corrections must take this movement into account. If DiIulio's assessment is correct, the pendulum may swing back in the direction of an earlier panacea—offender rehabilitation. If this occurs, the system may or may not be larger, depending on the effectiveness of this "new" strategy. Even a cursory review of the research on new prison/jail admissions underscores the continuous movement of offenders between institutional and community control. For example, a recent Bureau of Justice Statistics *Bulletin* (May 1993) reported that "the percentage of state prison admissions entering as violators of probation or parole conditions increased from about 17% of all admissions in 1980 to 30% of all admissions in 1991" (p. 1). One thing is certain: *deterrence-oriented* intermediate sanction programs have not interrupted this cycle/recycling process; in fact, they appear to have made matters worse. In the next few years, we may discover whether a new wave of rehabilitation-oriented sanctions *can* have a different effect.

Rehabilitation

Up to this point, we have focused on the retributive and deterrent components of any sanction for criminal behavior. However, a third dimension of sentencing can be identified: offender treatment. In recent years, there has been much discussion about the *individual* goal of treatment being offender change and the *social* goal of treatment being community protection through the reduction of crime (Palmer, 1992). This latter goal, of course, is the goal of any program based on the notion of specific deterrence. The difference lies in the *means* used to attain this goal. If we think of the treatment dimension of sentencing in this manner, we need to determine what institutional and community-based treatment programs are available and then to evaluate the extent to which these treatment programs actually reduce an offender's risk of recidivism.

Focusing for the moment on community-based programs, we think there is evidence in the area of intermediate sanctions, particularly in the area of intensive supervision, that offenders who receive

treatment for substance abuse, employment, and individual/family problems have lower recidivism rates than offenders who do not. Perhaps the best example is the multi-site intensive supervision evaluation (of a random field experiment) of 14 sites around the country, which was conducted by RAND Corporation researchers Joan Petersilia and Susan Turner. Although the researchers found no overall differences in recidivism across those 14 intensive supervision programs, within each of them the offenders who received treatment had significantly lower recidivism rates, even controlling for offender background characteristics (Petersilia & Turner, 1993).

Similar findings have been reported by other researchers. For example, an evaluation conducted on intensive probation supervision in Massachusetts found that offenders who receive services in the areas of substance abuse treatment, employment, and individual/family problems had significantly lower recidivism rates than offenders who did not receive treatment (Byrne & Kelly, 1989). Although we need to recognize the limitations of this new wave of research (e.g., small sample sizes, research design flaws, program implementation problems, few direct measures of treatment quality), rehabilitation advocates are rightfully optimistic. It appears that we need to improve the treatment components of community supervision programs if we are interested in providing both "just deserts" in terms of fair punishment and a higher level of community protection and control. The same general statement can be offered regarding the need for improved treatment programming in various institutional settings, including boot camp programs.

Control

It is one thing to discuss the *philosophy* of sentencing offenders to either institutional or community-based programs; it is quite another thing entirely to discuss the *practical* aspects of managing offenders in both settings. In the area of community corrections, we need to decide what we are going to do when offenders do not comply with the conditions of their sentence (Rhine, 1993). This can perhaps be described best as the control dimension of these sanctions. Probably the most important change that we have had, and the most interesting emerging trend over the next 10 years or so, is the increased use of technology to monitor offender compliance with the conditions of various programs. Because we have improved technology, we have much more information on offenders than in the past; on their lifestyles, on where they go, on what they do, on whether they are currently using drugs, and on whether they are currently violating their curfews. We also know more in terms of offender classification. We know more about offender types and how to link various offenders to various forms of treat-

ment. Because of improvements in technology, we know more about offenders today than we have at any other time in the past.

The question is what to do with the information. As Donald Cochran, Commissioner of Probation in Massachusetts, has observed, new information systems are great, in theory, but we have to decide what our programs are going to do in response to the information they yield—in particular, to negative information about offenders (Cochran, 1992). This is especially true in a surveillance-oriented program, where attempts are made to monitor offenders' movements in the community and to detect specific behavior patterns (e.g., drug use, alcohol use, curfew violations, employment, peer associations). As we noted earlier, one in three state prison admissions in 1992 was a probation or parole violator. In this respect, the issue of revocation policy is critical to any "predictions" about the future size of the *institutional* system, because it is apparent that our prison and jail systems are being filled today by probation and parole failures. If we develop policies and programs that result in fewer failures, then there would be less demand for more prison/jail space.

For example, in order to deal with the large number of technical violators who were coming back into the institutional system, Georgia recently passed legislation which limits the ability of community corrections agencies to place an offender directly in prison or jail for violating a technical condition of probation. Instead, the offender must be placed in another type of community program first. Georgia's legislative response to the problem forces program developers to rethink their approach to technical violators, using a structured hierarchy of intermediate sanctions in lieu of incarceration. Although it is difficult to predict whether other states will follow Georgia's lead, we suspect that the issue of control is going to be critical to the future viability of the "next" wave of community-based programs. It is one thing to set conditions that establish a unique level of punishment and treatment in a program. It is quite another thing to enforce that punishment and to monitor compliance with various treatment conditions.

Conclusions: Can We Envision a Different Correctional Future?

How we answer the questions we have raised in the above four policy areas (punishment, deterrence, treatment, and control) will determine whether, in the next 10 years, we go in the direction DiIulio predicts, which is essentially more of the same (with a nod toward alternatives to incarceration and rehabilitation), or whether we decide to move the system in another direction altogether. At this point, the ques-

tion we have to ask is this: if the system is going to move in a direction other than more crowding and more offenders, what will we—as policymakers, practitioners, researchers, and the public—have to do? Our answer to this question should be obvious by this point: we will need to change fundamentally the way we think about punishment, corrections, and the dynamics of community control.

Toward this end, there are three fundamental changes in community corrections practice that we envision by the end of the decade. First, there is going to be increasing pressure on state legislatures to consider not only alternatives to incarceration but also alternatives to traditional probation. For this reason, we anticipate an increased use of nonsupervision sanctions—such as day fines and community service—over the next 10 years. We doubt that they will be used at the level they are in England and other countries, but certainly at least 10 to 20 percent of the correctional population can be sanctioned in this manner with no increased threat to the community. This first change would result in significant reductions in the size of the traditional probation population. Currently, successful day fine programs are being operated in several states (e.g., New York, Connecticut, Arizona), while stand-alone community service programs are also making a comeback across the country (McDonald, 1992).

Second, we expect state and local corrections systems to embrace fully the idea of unique, stand-alone intermediate punishments. These sanctions will attempt to combine elements of punishment and treatment, reinforced by a structured hierarchy of sanctions for offender noncompliance. Although less than 5 percent of the correctional population is currently placed in one of these programs, we predict that, by the end of the decade, one of every three convicted offenders will be placed in an intermediate punishment program. These programs will likely draw their population from two sources: the “high risk” offender types currently under supervision and certain offense types (drug, alcohol) currently incarcerated. Of course, along with the shift of *offenders*, there will have to be a reallocation of correctional resources. For this reason, we anticipate that *both* institutional corrections administrators and (traditional) probation/parole administrators will battle for control of these programs.

In addition to the creation of a more fully utilized system of intermediate sanctions, we will also need to redefine traditional probation strategies, perhaps by borrowing from the concept of community-oriented policing, which itself borrows from the probation and parole practices of the late 1960's and early 1970's. This would be a community-oriented approach, designed to address the problems and needs of offenders

and their victims within the same local area. In this community-based model, traditional probation programs would move out of the office and into the streets. Many practitioners recognize that, while formal deterrence might be a good public focus for any corrections system, it is informal deterrence mechanisms that seem to work the best as offender control strategies (Cochran, 1992). The relationships between probation officers and offenders, the relationships between offenders and family members, and certainly the relationships between offenders and their peers, are going to have the most impact on offenders' behavior in the community (Braswell, 1989). Traditional probation practices should be designed to focus on improving these informal mechanisms, and in our view the best way to accomplish this is by reintroducing probation officers to the community. Stated simply, probation officers need to spend *less* time in the courthouse focusing on nonsupervision tasks and more time at the offender's home and in the community.

A Final Thought

To the extent that increased informal community control results in less demand for formal criminal justice involvement, the turn of the century may be marked by lower, not higher, crime rates, despite demographic trends. If this occurs, the trickle down effect on our correctional system should be obvious. Ultimately, the question becomes: can we continue to muddle through, relying on assumptions about the effectiveness of incarceration and formal deterrence that are simply not true? It appears to us that the answer is no and that new approaches to dealing with various types of offenders (e.g., property offenders, drug users, drunk drivers, and mentally ill offenders) must be developed. To quote DiIulio (1991, p. 270), “the future of American corrections permits no escape from [the] delicate moral balancing act” between “punishment and hate one moment, reform and love the next” (p. 210). It is time now for Federal, state, and local corrections policymakers to assess how the scale is balanced in their own systems and then to act accordingly.

REFERENCES

- Austin, J., & Irwin, J. (1993). *Does imprisonment reduce crime? A critique of "voodoo" criminology*. San Francisco, CA: National Council on Crime and Delinquency.
- Braswell, M. (1989). Correctional treatment and the human spirit: A focus on relationship. *Federal Probation*, 53(2), 49-60.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (1993). *Bulletin: Prisoners in 1992*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Byrne, J.M., & Kelly, L. (1989). *Restructuring probation as an intermediate sanction. An evaluation of the Massachusetts Intensive Probation Supervision Program* (Final Report). Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

- Byrne, J., & Pattavina, A. (1992). The effectiveness issue: Assessing what works in the adult community corrections system. In J. Byrne, A. Lurigio, & J. Petersilia (Eds.), *Smart sentencing: The emergence of intermediate sanctions* (pp.281-306). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Byrne, J., Lurigio, A., & Petersilia, J. (Eds.). (1992). *Smart sentencing: The emergence of intermediate sanctions*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Cochran, D. (1992). The long road from policy development to real change in sanctioning practice. In J. Byrne, A. Lurigio, & J. Petersilia (Eds.), *Smart sentencing: The emergence of intermediate sanctions* (pp. 307-318). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- DiIulio, J.I., Jr. (1991). *No escape: The future of American corrections*. New York: Basic Books.
- Edna McConnell Clark Foundation. (1992). *Americans behind bars*. New York: Edna McConnell Clark Foundation.
- Finckenauer, J. (1982). *Scared Straight! And the panacea phenomenon*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Lipton, D., Martinson, R., & Wilks, J. (1975). *The effectiveness of correctional treatment: A survey of treatment evaluation studies*. New York: Praeger.
- Maguire, K., Pastore, A., & Flanagan, T. (Eds.). (1993). *Sourcebook of criminal justice statistics 1992*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- McDonald, D. (1992). Punishing labor: Unpaid community service as a criminal sentence. In J. Byrne, A. Lurigio, & J. Petersilia (Eds.), *Smart sentencing: The emergence of intermediate sanctions* (pp. 182-193). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Morris, N., & Tonry, M. (1990). *Between prison and probation: Intermediate sanctions in a rational sentencing system*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Palmer, T. (1992). *The re-emergence of correctional intervention*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Petersilia, J., & Turner, S. (1993). Evaluating intensive supervision probation/parole: Results of a nationwide experiment. *Research In Brief*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Rhine, E. (Ed.) (1993). *Intermediate sanctions for probation and parole violators*. Laurel, MD: American Correctional Association.
- Steffensmeier, D., & Harer, M. (1993). Bulging prisons, an aging U.S. population and the nation's violent crime rate. *Federal Probation*, 58(2), 3-11.
- von Hirsch, A. (1992). Scaling intermediate punishments: A comparison of two models. In J. Byrne, A. Lurigio, & J. Petersilia (Eds.), *Smart sentencing: The emergence of intermediate sanctions* (pp. 211-228). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.