

# The Effects of Sex Offender Treatment in a Correctional Setting

*Ada L. Alvarez, M.B.A.*  
*Abby L. Carbaugh, Ph.D.*  
*Rita Augustyn, M.A.*

ACJS Presentation  
March 22, 2017

# Introduction

- Fear of these crimes and need for treatment.
  - (Braddock & Renzema, 1998; Bragg, 2007, Cain, 2008; Cohen & Jeglic, 2007; Daly, 2008; English et al., 2000; Petrunik & Deutschmann, 2008;. Pratt, 2000; Terry & Ackerman, 2009; Sample & Kadleck, 2008; Wright, 2008)
- The recidivism rates of sex offenders are very low in comparison to other types of offenders.
  - (Hanson & Bussiere, 1998; Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2004)
- It is estimated that between 5% and 14% of them will be rearrested for a new sex crime within the first few years of their release.
  - (Levenson, Prescott, & D'Amora, 2010; Nicholaichuk, Gordon, Gu, & Wong, 2000; Beech, Mandeville-Norden, & Goodwill, 2012)
- 58% of sex offenders never attend treatment and 68% of those who begin treatment do not complete it.
  - (Langevin, 2006).
- Those who remain in the program until it is complete but do not reach the treatment program goals have higher recidivism rates than those who similarly complete treatment but achieve the goals.
  - (Marques et al., 2005)

# Good Lives Model

- Good Lives Model: a strengths-based approach to offender rehabilitation that asserts that individuals' strengths as well as environmental factors are pivotal in the rehabilitation process (Barnett, Manderville-Norden, & Rokestrow, 2014; Scoones, Willis, & Grace, 2012; Ward & Stewart, 2003).
  - This model equips offenders with the knowledge, skills, opportunities, and resources necessary to satisfy their life values in ways that do not harm others.
  - Primary goods are certain states of mind, personal characteristics, and experiences such as life, inner peace, spirituality, knowledge, excellence in work, etc. and secondary goods are approach goals that provide concrete means of securing primary goods (Birgden, 2002).
- Dialectical Behavior Therapy (DBT)
  - Cognitive Behavioral Approach
  - Characteristics: support-oriented, cognitive-based, and collaborative

# Background of Programs

- The sex offender programs (iHeLP, oHeLP, & bHeLP) are offered to inmates when they are approaching eligibility for parole in their felony sentence.
  - iHeLP: inpatient, high risk to sexually reoffend, 2-3 years, specific housing unit, group and individual therapy.
  - oHeLP: outpatient, moderate risk to sexually reoffend, about a year to complete, group therapy.
    - Both iHeLP and oHeLP operate as an open-ended (or rolling) group.
  - bHeLP: outpatient, low risk to sexually reoffend, 9 weeks
- Admission Criteria:
  - Screened by clinicians based on Static 99-R, Stable, and Acute, Pre-sentence Investigation, class study, staff input, and institutional behavior.
  - Sex offenders who deny their offense are not excluded from treatment.

# Research Question

- Do people who complete sex offender treatment programs while incarcerated have lower recidivism rates than people who don't?
  - Population: males released during FY2012 and FY2013 who had sex offender treatment program recommendations
  - Treatment Group: Satisfactory or adequate progression
  - Comparison Group: Unsatisfactory progression, termination, withdrawals
- Original analytic strategy: Propensity Score Matching
  - Simulate random assignment into treatment and control condition
  - Not enough data for causal analysis
- Adjusted strategy: Exploratory study
  - Identify differences on key characteristics
  - Explore foundational information for future research

# Sample

- Male inmates released from correctional facilities in a Midwestern state with sex offender treatment recommendations
  - 4,275 total releases in Fiscal Years 2012 & 2013
  - 251 (5.9 %) of releases had sex offender treatment recommendations

Recommendation	Comparison Group (64.9%)	Treatment Group (35.1%)	Total
bHeLP	32	47	79
oHeLP	87	37	124
iHeLP	44	4	48
<b>Total</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>251</b>

# Recidivism 2012 & 2013

Total Sample size = 251

<b>Time Frame</b>	<b>Total Recidivated</b>	<b>New Recidivists</b>	<b>Recidivism Rate</b>
1 year	15	15	6%
2 year	22	7	8.8%
3 year	28	6	11.2%

# Recidivism & Program Completion

Comparison Group	Treatment Group	Total
163	88	251
15 Recidivated	13 Recidivated	28 Recidivists
9.2%	14.7%	11.2%

Other Programming for Recidivists:

Had a violence recommendation (n=3)

Had a substance use recommendation (n=12)

**Treatment Group:** Those that completed program adequately/satisfactory.

**Comparison Group:** Those that dropped out/ had recommendation and did not start/ completed unsuccessfully.

Not Statistically significant,  
 $p=.11$



# Programming

Recommendation	Comparison Group		Treatment Group		Total
	<i>Recidivated</i>	<i>NOT Recidivated</i>	<i>Recidivated</i>	<i>NOT Recidivated</i>	
bHeLP	3	29	8	39	79
oHeLP	4	83	4	33	124
iHeLP	8	36	1	3	48
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>251</b>

# Demographics

Race	Comparison Group	Treatment Group
Black	4	1
Hispanic	1	2
Native American	2	0
White	8	10
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>13</b>

Age at Release	Comparison Group	Treatment Group
19-25	4	3
26-30	5	4
31-35	1	3
36 & Up	5	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>13</b>

# Original Convictions

Original Crime Type	Comparison Group	Treatment Group	Total
Contact-Child	8	5	13
Contact-Adult	2	7	9
Registration Violation	2	0	2
Non-Sex Related	3	1	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>28</b>

# Release Type

Release Type	Comparison Group (n=170)	Treatment Group (n=89)
Parole	4	10
<i>Technical violation</i>	2	6
<i>Law violation on Parole</i>		0
<i>Law violation after Parole Discharge</i>	2	4
Discharge	11	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>13</b>

# Reason for Return to Prison

Recidivism Crime Type	Comparison Group		Treatment Group		Total
	<i>Paroled</i>	<i>Discharged</i>	<i>Paroled</i>	<i>Discharged</i>	
No Contact –Child	1		3		4
Contact-Child			1		1
Contact-Adult	1	3	2		6
Registration Law Violation		3	2		5
Non-Sex Related Law Violation		5		3	8
Non-Sex Related Technical Parole Violation	2		2		4
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>28</b>

# Future Considerations

- Program design and target population
  - Good Lives Model research primarily based in Canada and UK
  - Studies of GLM effectiveness in US tied primarily to community settings
  - No known studies of GLM applied in US prison setting
  - Importance of fidelity of program implementation
  - Significant cultural differences between US and Canada/UK
- Outcome measurement (Relationships, unemployment, financial stability)
- Individual Characteristics
  - Sentence length
  - Pre- and post-incarceration risk assessment scores
  - Recidivism offenses
- Follow-up Period

# References

- Barnett, G.D., Manderville-Norden, R., & Rakestrow, J. (2014) The Good Lives Model or Relapse Prevention: What Works Better in Facilitating Change? *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 26(1), 3-33
- Beech, A.R., Manderville-Norden, R., & Goodwill, A. (2012) Comparing Recidivism Rates of Treatment Responders/Nonresponders in a Sample of 413 Child Molesters Who Had Completed Community-Based Sex Offender Treatment in the United Kingdom. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 56(1), 29-49
- Birgden A. (2002) Therapeutic jurisprudence and “Good Lives”: A rehabilitation framework for corrections. *Australian Psychologist*, 37(3), 180-186
- Braddock, E. & Renzema, M. (1998). Containing pedophiles: Benefits and concerns of having a polygraph examiner on the team. *The Journal of Offender Monitoring*, 11(3), 15-20.
- Bragg, D. (2007). A look at ten years of polygraph testing in Virginia. *The Journal*. The Virginia Probation and Parole Association, 371.
- Cain, K. B. (2008) Managing convicted sex offenders in the community. Washington, DC: NGA Center for Best Practices.
- Cohen, M. & Jeglic, E. L. (2007). Sex offender legislation in the United States: What do we know? *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 51(4), 369-383.
- Daly, R. (2008). Treatment and reentry practices for sex offenders: An overview of states. New York: Vera Institute of Justice.
- English, K., Jones, L., Pasini-Hill, D., Patrick, D., & Cooley-Towell, S. (2000). The value of polygraph testing in sex offender management. Denver, CO: Department of Public Safety.
- Hanson, R. K., & Bussiere, M. T. (1998). Predicting relapse: a meta-analysis of sexual offender recidivism studies. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology*, 66(2), 348.
- Hanson, R. K., & Morton-Bourgon, K. (2004). Predictors of sexual recidivism: An updated meta-analysis 2004-02. *Ottawa, Canada: Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada*.
- Langevin, R. (2006). Acceptance and completion of treatment among sex offenders. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 50, 402-417
- Levenson, J.S., Prescott, D.S., & D’Amora, D.A. (2010) Sex Offender Treatment: Consumer Satisfaction and Engagement in Therapy. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 54(3), 307-326
- Marques, J.K., Wiederanders, M., Day, D.M., Nerlson, C., & Ommeren, A.V. (2005) Effects of a Relapse Prevention Program on Sexual Recidivism: Final Results From California’s Sex Offender Treatment and Evaluation Project (SOTEP). *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 17(1), 79-107
- Nicholaichuk, T., Gordon, A., Gu, D., & Wong, S. (2000) Outcome of an Institutional Sexual Offender Treatment Program: A Comparison Between Treated and Matched Untreated Offenders. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 12(2), 139-153
- Petrunik, M. & Deutschmann, L. (2008). The exclusion-inclusion spectrum in state and community response to sex offenders in Anglo-American and European jurisdictions. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 52(5), 499-519.
- Pratt, J. (2000). Sex crimes and the new punitiveness. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 18(2-3), 135-151.
- Sample, L. L. & Kadleck, C. (2008). Sex offender laws: Legislators' accounts of the need for policy. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 19(1), 40-62.
- Scoones, C.D., Willis, G.M., & Grace, R.C. (2012) Beyond Static and Dynamic Risk Factors: The Incremental Validity of Release Planning for Predicting Sex Offender Recidivism. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 27(2), 222-238
- Terry, K. J. & Ackerman, A. R. (2009). A brief history of major sex offender laws. In R.G. Wright (Ed.), *Sex Offender Laws: Failed Policies, New Directions*. New York: Springer Publishing Company.
- Ward, T., & Stewart C.A. (2003) The Treatment of Sex Offenders: Risk Management and Good Lives. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 34(4) 353-360
- Wright, R. G. (2008). Sex offender post-incarceration sanctions: Are there any limits? *New England Journal on Criminal and Civil Confinement*, 34, 17-50.

# Appendix 1

Contact-Child Offense Arrest	Contact-Adult Offense Arrest
INTERSTATE TRANSFER SEXOFFENSE	SEXUAL ABUSE OF INMATE/PAROLEE
SEXUAL ASSULT OF CHILD 2ND DEG	SEXUAL ASSAULT 1ST DEGREE
SEXUAL ASSULT OF CHILD 1ST DEG	SEXUAL ASSAULT 2ND DEGREE
SEXUAL ASSULT OF CHILD 3RD DEG	SEXUAL ASSAULT 3RD DEGREE
SEXUAL ASSAULT ON A CHILD	SEX ABUSE/PRCTED INDIV 1ST DEG
INCEST	SEX ABUSE/PRCTED INDIV 2ND DEG