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TITLE OF THE REVIEW

Interventions that Promote Compliance with Authority in Correctional Settings: A Systematic Review

BACKGROUND

To maintain an orderly environment, most correctional institutions are dependent on inmates’ acceptance of the authority of the organization and staff. The threat of punishment and sanctions doubtless contributes to inmates’ compliance with directives about the behavior required of them, but there are other aspects of the conditions in correctional settings and the experiences inmates have there that are also influential (Wortely, 2002).

One such factor is the nature of the programs and interventions to which inmates are exposed. These programs may be aimed at shaping appropriate institutional behavior directly (e.g., token economies and behavioral contracting), altering the impulses and rationalizations presumed to underlie misbehavior (e.g., cognitive-behavioral therapy), or simply providing constructive alternatives (e.g., work-release programs, recreational programs). A variety of such interventions has been shown to be effective in reducing misconduct within correctional settings (French & Gendreau, 2006).

Knowing which interventions are effective for reducing misconduct and maintaining order would be useful for administrators of correctional institutions and other decision makers who influence correctional policy. The purpose of this review is to summarize the findings of the methodologically credible international research on this topic in a manner that will be informative to such consumers. It will consider a broad range of interventions, correctional settings, and relevant outcomes for juvenile and adult offenders.

OBJECTIVES

This review will be guided by the following overarching questions:

1. Which interventions with inmates in correctional settings has the available research found to have favourable effects on compliance and misconduct in those settings?

2. Are there some interventions that are especially effective with certain subgroups of inmates (e.g., demographic subgroups; types of offenders)?

3. Are there some interventions that are especially effective for reducing certain kinds of misconduct (e.g., aggressive behavior)?
EXISTING REVIEWS

Two systematic reviews of research on the effects of interventions in correctional settings that examined institutional misbehavior as an outcome have been reported, neither of which is very recent. Keyes (1996) reviewed 33 studies of interventions to prevent prisoner misconduct and reported a mean phi coefficient of $r = .06$, which was not statistically significant but in the direction of reduced misbehavior. The 15 effect sizes for behavioral programs, however, had a mean of $r = .17$, while the mean for the 18 effect sizes from other types of interventions was $r = -.02$, showing a slight increase in misbehavior. French and Gendreau (2006) updated the Keyes review with a meta-analysis of 68 randomized and non-randomized studies that generated 104 effect sizes. They also found that behavioral interventions had larger effects on prison misconduct ($r = .26, k = 40$) than nonbehavioral interventions ($r = -.10, k = 31$). Not all of the studies included in the Keyes (1996) and French and Gendreau (2006) reviews used high quality experimental or quasi-experimental designs, however, and additional studies have been reported since these reviews were completed.

INTERVENTION

Eligible interventions will include any program or treatment, broadly defined, that has as its aim, either implicitly or explicitly, the reduction, prevention, or remediation of some form of misconduct or problem behavior by inmates in a correctional facility. Such interventions will be identified by either (a) language in the study report that explicitly describes one of the objectives of the intervention as a reduction of misconduct within the facility, and/or (b) an implicit targeting of misconduct within the facility because such behavior is measured as an outcome variable and results on that outcome are presented in the study report.

Eligible control or comparison conditions will be practice as usual; that is, whatever programs or practices are part of the usual regimen in the respective correctional facility other than the intervention provided to the treatment group that is the object of study.

POPULATION

The setting for the study must be a residential facility for juvenile or adult offenders who have been mandated to reside there by a juvenile or criminal court; that is, a correctional facility of some sort. These may be high security facilities from which inmates are not allowed to leave or low security facilities that allow some freedom of movement (e.g., day passes, work release) but nonetheless require residence in the facility. Excluded are specialized facilities for distinctive offender populations other than gender, e.g., psychiatric facilities, facilities only for offenders with drug abuse problems, sex offenders, and the like.

The sample that provides the data for any eligible outcomes must be specifically identified as juvenile or criminal offenders-- individuals who have committed chargeable offenses, been
adjudicated through an authoritative court process, and sentenced to custody in the respective facility. The sample may include the full population(s) of the respective facilities or a subset that is generally representative of the population of the facility. Samples selected to represent particular types of offenders within a facility, e.g., gang members, those with mental illness, substance use, or particular types of sentences, or those selected because of the offense for which they are incarcerated, such as violent offenses, sex offenses, and the like, will not be eligible. An exception is for samples within a facility that are explicitly selected because of misbehavior within the facility or explicitly selected because they were judged to be at risk for such misbehavior. The individuals in the sample must be in residence in the facility at the time when any eligible treatments are applied and any eligible outcomes are measured, but the facility may be in any country and the associated research may be reported in any language.

OUTCOMES

To be eligible, a study must report measurement of at least one outcome variable that represents a form of behavior among the inmates of the facility that is or can be viewed as problematic from the standpoint of the authorities managing the facility. Eligible outcome variables include such behavior as rule infractions; misconduct; compliance with instructions, rules, procedures, or policies; institutional maladjustment; aggression or conflict; attacks on staff; and the like. Positive versions of these variables would also be eligible, e.g., institutional adjustment, etc.

STUDY DESIGNS

Eligible research designs include experimental or quasi-experimental designs that compare eligible outcomes for subject groups receiving or exposed to an eligible intervention with subject groups that did not receive that intervention, i.e., control/comparison groups. In particular, eligible experimental or quasi-experimental designs must meet at least one of the following criteria: (a) Participants were randomly assigned to intervention and control conditions; (b) participants were matched or statistically controlled on variables measured prior to intervention that included at least one recognizable risk variable for the eligible outcomes (see definition below); (c) if participants were neither randomly assigned nor matched, the study must provide specific pre-intervention (baseline) data that allow for an assessment of the degree of pre-intervention equivalence between the intervention and comparison groups on at least one recognizable risk variable for the eligible outcomes. Acceptable risk variables for eligible institutional misconduct outcomes include (a) prior history of institutional problem behavior, and (b) scores from a risk assessment for misconduct, including institutional classifications for the level of security applied to inmates.
Posttest-only non-equivalent comparison designs (not randomized and with no pre-intervention baseline variables) are not eligible. One-group pretest-posttest (before-after) designs are also ineligible.
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ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Please give a brief description of content and methodological expertise within the review team. It is recommended to have at least one person on the review team who has content expertise, at least one person who has methodological expertise and at least one person who has statistical expertise. It is also recommended to have one person with information retrieval expertise. Please note that this is the recommended optimal review team composition.

- Content: Mark Lipsey is a senior researcher who has conducted systematic reviews of interventions for juvenile and adult offenders for decades. These reviews have been supported with funding from major federal agencies and foundations (e.g., OJJDP, NIJ, NIH, W.T. Grant Foundation), published in peer reviewed journals, and recognized by, among others, awards from the American Society of Criminology, the American
Evaluation Association, the Society for Prevention Research. The proposed systematic review is a direct extension of this previous work.

- Systematic review methods: Mark Lipsey, Josh Polanin, and Jan Morrison are all knowledgeable and experienced with all phases of systematic review methods. In addition to decades of experience conducting systematic reviews, Lipsey has served as Co-Chair of the Campbell Collaboration, is a Founding Trustee of the Society of Research Synthesis Methodology (SRSM) and has served as Co-Editor-in Chief of the SRSM journal, *Research Synthesis Methods*, is co-author (with David Wilson) of the textbook, *Practical Meta-Analysis*, and has published multiple articles and chapters on methodological topics in meta-analysis.

  Josh Polanin is the Managing Editor for the Campbell Collaboration Methods Group, Secretary for the Special Interest Group in AERA on Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis in Education, and author or co-author on several published systematic reviews and articles on methodological topics in meta-analysis. Jan Morrison is a staff research analyst at the Peabody Research Institute who has worked on meta-analysis projects under the supervision of Mark Lipsey for more than ten years. She has particular experience and expertise on literature searching, setting up computer based coding systems for meta-analysis, and coding studies for systematic reviews.

- Statistical analysis: Along with their general systematic reviewing methodological credentials summarized above, Mark Lipsey and Josh Polanin both are knowledgeable and experienced on meta-analysis statistical techniques. This is represented in the statistical analyses used in published meta-analyses and in published papers and books that address statistical analysis issues.

- Information retrieval: Lipsey, Polanin, and Morrison are all have literature search and retrieval experience for locating studies to include in meta-analysis, well more than 10 years each for Lipsey and Morrison. That experience covers electronic bibliographic searches, ancestry searches using the references in retrieved studies, and hand search methods. It also includes use of some of the relatively new screening tools for supporting the review of abstracts, e.g., the Abstrackr program developed by colleagues at Brown University.
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Financial support for this review has been provided by the Norwegian Correctional Service via the Norwegian Knowledge Centre and the Campbell Collaboration. No deadline has been set for delivery of the final approved review, but active progress and deliberate speed are expected.
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PRELIMINARY TIMEFRAME

Note, if the protocol or review are not submitted within 6 months and 18 months of title registration, respectively, the review area is opened up for other authors.

- Date you plan to submit a draft protocol: June 30, 2015.
- Date you plan to submit a draft review: August 1, 2015

Note: This review is currently well underway. The protocol can be submitted soon after the title is registered and the draft review should follow with minimal delay after that.
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A draft protocol must be submitted to the Coordinating Group within one year of title acceptance. If drafts are not submitted before the agreed deadlines, or if we are unable to contact you for an extended period, the Coordinating Group has the right to de-register the title or transfer the title to alternative authors. The Coordinating Group also has the right to de-register or transfer the title if it does not meet the standards of the Coordinating Group and/or the Campbell Collaboration.

You accept responsibility for maintaining the review in light of new evidence, comments and criticisms, and other developments, and updating the review every five years, when substantial new evidence becomes available, or, if requested, transferring responsibility for maintaining the review to others as agreed with the Coordinating Group.

Publication in the Campbell Library

The support of the Coordinating Group in preparing your review is conditional upon your agreement to publish the protocol, finished review, and subsequent updates in the Campbell Library. The Campbell Collaboration places no restrictions on publication of the findings of a Campbell systematic review in a more abbreviated form as a journal article either before or after the publication of the monograph version in Campbell Systematic Reviews. Some journals, however, have restrictions that preclude publication of findings that have been, or will be, reported elsewhere and authors considering publication in such a journal should be
aware of possible conflict with publication of the monograph version in *Campbell Systematic Reviews*. Publication in a journal after publication or in press status in *Campbell Systematic Reviews* should acknowledge the Campbell version and include a citation to it. Note that systematic reviews published in *Campbell Systematic Reviews* and co-registered with the Cochrane Collaboration may have additional requirements or restrictions for co-publication. Review authors accept responsibility for meeting any co-publication requirements.
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