Serious Offenders: Using Evidence to Predict and Manage the Risk

Dominic A. S. Pearson^{a*}

dominic.pearson@port.ac.uk

Cynthia McDougall^b

cynthia.mcdougall@york.ac.uk

^a University of Portsmouth

King Henry Building

King Henry I Street

Portsmouth

United Kingdom

PO1 2DY

^b University of York

Heslington

York

United Kingdom

YO10 5DD

*Corresponding author

Tel: 00 44 (0)2392 846635

Fax: 00 44 (0)2392 846300

Serious Offenders: Using Evidence to Predict and Manage the Risk

Abstract

In response to the risk of serious further offences, an evidence-based approach is needed in risk management. A recent joint prison-probation inspection of the management of life sentence prisoners in six UK prisons found that the quality of assessment and plans to manage risk of harm to others was insufficient with too much focus on the offender's verbal account. The present paper discusses observations of regular prisoner behaviour as the basis for predictions, and summarises results of an evaluation of this methodology based on a sample of high-risk category prisoners released into the community. Prison behaviour has not traditionally been seen as a valid risk marker for violent recidivism, which may be because typically only conspicuous high-level behaviours are considered by risk management panels. Our research suggests that we are neglecting a valuable source of information on risk by failing to observe on-going and consistent pre-release behaviour.

Key Words: Offender management; Prison behaviour; Prison misconduct; Public safety; Risk assessment; Risk prediction; Violence prevention

As practising forensic psychologists we have been closely involved with decisions on the risk management of serious offenders. With very little known about the further offending of homicide perpetrators (Liem, 2013), secure institutions struggle with decisions on the conditional release of potentially dangerous persons. Public safety and human rights issues are inharmoniously at stake, and the current paper recommends the increased use of evidence-based assessment of these offenders based on monitoring current dynamic behaviours. Institutional behaviours are often regarded as unsuitable, and here we will give the background on offender risk assessment, and describe some of the theoretical perspectives on behaviour monitoring including how this influences the extent (and form) to which regular prison behaviour currently contributes to assessment. In presenting the case we will discuss gaps that may be filled by a different kind of behaviour analysis, behavioural observation. Finally an application of behavioural monitoring with serious offenders in England will be discussed as an example of this approach (McDougall, Pearson, Willoughby, & Bowles, 2013).

A light-bulb moment regarding the contribution of observations of behaviour came while working with a public protection team responsible for supervising dangerous prison releases. The director of the team came to the office and asked if we could attend a public protection panel meeting concerning the post-release management of a serious offender. We went along to the meeting with little preparation and were confronted with the following case. A high-security prison was about to release a man in his late 30s who was sentenced for having violently raped his young step-daughter (aged 13). We learned that he had also prostituted his wife. In custody he had completed the recommended treatment programmes, with good reports, but now we were going to be faced with a man who did not want to talk about his offending behaviour, particularly

with the allocated female member of staff responsible for his supervision. The faces all turned in our direction. Our response was unanimous: “What has his sexual behaviour been like in prison?”, and so was theirs (none). We later learned that our question was highly embarrassing to the senior managers and practitioners around the table; no one was systematically collecting this type of information. Have we developed a commitment to a different kind of evidence? The American Psychological Association (APA) determined that Evidence-Based Practice in Psychology is “the integration of the best available research with clinical expertise in the context of patient characteristics, culture, and preferences” (APA Presidential Task Force on Evidence-Based Practice, 2006, p.273).

We were committed to the empirical evidence which supports, on an inductive level, the validity of behavioural risk factors (see below). For individual risk of harm assessment, however, we espoused combining this with a deductive approach based on clinical expertise of the demonstrable facts of the particular case. In line with recommendations under *Tarasoff* duty to protect assessments¹ (*Tarasoff v. Regents of the University of California*, 1976) we asked what we have observed that can be a reasonable basis for our predictions. Behaviour observed may be a manifestation of an offender’s ‘criminogenic needs’ or dynamic risk factors linked to their violence. The identification and measurement of dynamic risk related to violence has been the subject of much research.

¹ The *Tarasoff* decision gave a broad legal requirement for clinicians to assess for targeted violence, and implied a duty to protect when the clinician has reasonable grounds to believe a specific individual is at imminent risk of serious harm.

Knowledge on risk factors and assessment.

The psychological literature is summarised in a comprehensive review by Hanson and Morton-Bourgon (2005) which included 82 studies and nearly 30,000 offenders. The predictors of general recidivism were found to overlap with those for sexual recidivism, but the latter also contained some distinctive features. There are two broad domains 'anti-social lifestyle' and 'sexual deviancy'. Anti-social lifestyle was characterised by features such as impulsivity, employment instability and general self-regulation problems, correlating $r=.11$ with sexual recidivism, while sexual preoccupations was the strongest example of sexual deviancy correlating with sexual recidivism $r=.19$. Antisocial orientation was also an important correlate of violent non-sexual recidivism ($r=.24$), and has been related to general recidivism in other populations including mentally disordered offenders (Bonta, Law, & Hanson, 1998) and mainstream offenders (Gendreau, Little, & Goggin, 1996; Yang, Wong, & Coid, 2010). In isolation, accuracy for the key factors in predicting serious recidivism in Hanson's review was therefore barely at the level of a small effect (Cohen, 1992). Factors unreliably associated with sexual recidivism were denial, victim empathy, low stated motivation for treatment, and poor progress in treatment (Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2005).

So the question for applied risk assessment must be how to combine the risk factors. Over the past 30 years the field has gone through generations of risk assessment, from unstructured professional judgement, to more structured professional judgement, and mechanical/actuarial methods, the latter identified by the use of explicit means to combine clinical or criminological items into a total score. The accuracy of

these methods has correspondingly improved, from $r=.20$, to $r=.22$, to $r=.32$ (Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2009). It is worth noting that the structured but discretionary method still falls short of reliability showing significant variability in the small number of studies included in Hanson and Morton-Bourgon (2009).

Clinical prediction: Abolition or amelioration?

One might ask where this leaves us in terms of risk management of serious offenders. Some have suggested that clinical prediction should be abolished on the basis that it does not satisfy the *Daubert* criteria for admissibility in court (*Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals*, 1993). Campbell (2000) argues this is because it is not transparent, cannot be tested/falsified due to an absence of numerical probabilities, and has no known error rates (three of the *Daubert* guidelines). Others call for amelioration; after all, clinical professionals will continue to be legally responsible for the management of dangerous individuals and they must use the most informed methods available (Mulvey & Lidz, 1985). There are three reasons why, despite strong general support for actuarial measures, we do not favour the abolition of (structured) clinical prediction in risk assessment of serious offenders.

First, the application of Actuarial Risk Assessments (ARAs) to serious offenders is limited by the absence of proven offence history to draw upon among a number of these offenders (Greenall & Richardson, 2015). An example would be Ian Huntley in the UK who murdered the two school-girls Holly Wells and Jessica Chapman and had one charge and some allegations on file, but no criminal convictions. Since ARAs emphasise the speed and rate of past offending, they deem low risk where there have been no previous convictions (or are invalid for use). Monahan (1981) noted that

“knowledge of the base-rate is the most important single piece of information to make an accurate prediction” (p.60). Although human judges are notoriously poor at using the base-rate (Kahneman & Tversky, 1973), for serious offenders such base-rates are not often available anyway.

Second, current ARAs do not have good evidence of predictive validity linking change in risk scores to change in reconviction outcome. Many of the measures are strongly weighted by criminal history, and psychological factors are highly stable, so scope for positive change is restricted. With serious offenders we need to know whether evidence of improvement or deterioration can be applied to the present case. ARA measures provide aggregate benefits suitable for organisational strategy on tiering service delivery, but there is a lack of risk measures currently that provide research-validated measurement of change within individuals (see Harris & Rice, 2015; Serin, Lloyd, Helmus, Derkzen, & Luong, 2013).² Clinical adjustments to risk actually reduced accuracy in the few relevant studies in Hanson and Morton-Bourgon (2009).

² Although there are examples in the literature of outcome-related changes in risk levels, we agree with Harris and Rice (2015) that to move from a hypothesis to an empirically supported fact, a test of within-participant risk reduction has to exclude the possibility of regression to the mean. That is, the Time 2 assessment has to be more accurate in predicting recidivism independent of the Time 1 assessment, which is not true for example when the assessment calculates ‘change scores’. Furthermore, to demonstrate that change is contributing to the outcome the Time 2 assessment of dynamic factors also has to improve on the Time 2 prediction provided by static factors.

Lastly, and of most legal importance, current ARAs are inductive based on a broad array of risk factors and base-rates, and are not designed for the prediction of individuals. This important issue bears heavily on rare serious offences which are unlikely to be well-represented in actuarial development samples. Individualised assessment and evidence of change is required by sexual predator laws and discretionary release decisions. In addition, ARAs provide assessment of longer term risk and rarely assess imminent risk to identified individuals as required by *Tarasoff*. Therefore clinical prediction of individual risk continues to be needed.

Practical reality of assessing individual risk.

So sitting around the risk management table, without considering individual behaviour, practitioners are left wondering how to integrate the initial risk status with the current presentation. We have to consider for example which items should be given the greatest weight relative to other items. Additional contextual pressures include time demands, leading to selective focus, system demands to free up prison spaces, and legal demands not to prevent prisoners from forward movement through the system.

We also had in mind the series of serious further offence inquiries that were published by Her Majesty's Inspectorate from 2005 (HMIP, 2006a, 2006b). The first of these concerned Damien Hanson and Elliot White, two offenders who were convicted of the murder of banker John Monkton and attempted murder of his wife Homeyra. Mr Monkton answered the door to a man claiming to be the postman who then stabbed him when he opened up. His daughter called the police but Mr Monkton died at the scene. Hanson was previously convicted of attempted murder (over a Rolex watch) and had recently been released, classed as a Medium risk of harm. Anthony Rice is a serious sex

offender who was convicted of the murder of Naomi Bryant. He had sexual violence offences mainly against adult women. Following a day out drinking with Naomi, soon after his release, he strangled her with a pair of her tights and repeatedly stabbed her to death. The last case is Daniel ‘Dano’ Sonnex who was serving an eight-year sentence for stabbing and armed robbery, during which he attracted over 40 prison adjudications for misconduct. He was released to torture and murder two French students in London, Laurent Bonomo and Gabriel Ferrez, over their mobile phones, computers and some cash (NOMS, 2009). In all three cases the men had completed accredited treatment programmes, convincing officials they had made the clinical (cognitive) changes, and, as described later, had shown continuity in their offending behaviour between prison and community. In adjusting risk not everyone succeeds in keeping these cases in mind; or, institutional pressures mitigate against this. The Inspectorate’s report into the management of life sentenced prisoners found that assessments were often inadequate, overlooking the risk of harm to others presented during the period of custody: “risks in prison are managed by the prison wall” (HMIP, 2013, p.19).

One might then ask what types of information are in fact communicated within public protection risk management meetings. In our experience the information can be characterised as offender self-report and major behaviours resulting in disciplinary sanctions. We see this as the ‘tip of the iceberg’ of risk behaviour, i.e., what the offender wants you to see, and there is not much awareness of lower level or hidden problem behaviours which might in fact be evolving offence behaviour.

Research and theoretical views on prison behaviour.

Challenges to the use of institutional behaviour.

Harnessing the information on behaviour within prison environments may be resisted because a number of authorities have suggested that prison behaviour may be situation-specific. On the one hand, the prison environment is particularly criminogenic, full of young and anti-social offenders. The constant influx of new prisoners and the rigid rules and regulations serve to reinforce anti-social attitudes and behaviours thereby increasing the likelihood of aggressive behaviour (Bukstel & Kilman, 1980; Gendreau, Goggin, & Law, 1997). On the other hand the environment may be seen as unusually structured and sterile, particularly among longer term populations, anticipating parole applications. Zamble and Porporino (2000, p.62) referred to it as a “behavioural deep freeze”. Furthermore, the specific triggers for offending may be absent, such as children and/or conflict with intimates. Or, some behaviour may still persist but offenders may use Detection Evasion Skills in the scrutinised environments, e.g., the therapy room, and relax their guard in other environments (Jones, 2004).

Theoretical propositions on the consistency of aggressive behaviour.

Again, the psychological literature may provide some guidance on what we should expect. Mischel developed the concept of unique ‘if..then’ behavioural signatures to explain how behaviour is consistent between situations depending on ‘cognitive-affective units’ (Mischel & Shoda, 1995), which others have taken forward as schematic knowledge or expectancies about people (Anderson & Bushman, 2002). Epstein (1983) proposed that behaviour is so situationally specific that it is essential to consider aggression across situations, matching with David Buss’ view that act frequency is a better index of personality than individual instances (Buss & Craik,

1983). Therefore these approaches used accumulated evidence in support of a person-specific view of behaviour.

Goldstein (2002) supported the view that for some individuals the rewards for aggressive behaviour in a range of situations were learned early, and were difficult to counteract in later years (Olweus, 1980). To prevent the development of a tendency for adopting an aggressive strategy to deal with a variety of situations, he argued for a 'catch it small' approach for low level behaviours. The kinds of behaviours Goldstein described as low level were insults, threats, bullying, 'horseplay', sexual harassment, refusals, defiance, and other generally disruptive aggressive behaviours, which are similar to the kinds of low level anti-social behaviour often displayed in prisons. Thus for some children aggression would be instrumental/strategic; for others it would result from poor self-regulation, but for both it would be a learned behaviour for achieving goals (Anderson & Bushman, 2002). Cross-situational consistency has also been examined in relation to crime analysis, which itself depends on behavioural consistency to link the way an offender behaves when conducting a series of crimes (Canter, 1995, p. 349). Here goal-directed behaviours may be more consistent and less situation-specific than more expressive behaviours. Hence there appears to be a basis to expect behavioural consistency, whether in goal-directed or expressive behaviours.

Empirical findings on institutional behaviour.

Aggressive behaviour has been studied in secure settings, but with inconsistent results which may be due to the type of outcome measure employed. Clark, Fisher and McDougall (1993) generated a unique set of predictive behaviours for each prisoner based on their original offence, and found a high degree of similarity in the functions of

behaviours (see below). A number of studies have also found that prison misconducts predict re-offending, including non-sexual offenders who offended sexually in prison and then sexually on release (Heil et al., 2009). Longitudinal studies have also shown that anti-social behaviour learned early acquired continuity being difficult to undermine later (e.g., Farrington, 1978). These studies are tempered by findings that official misconducts often show little or no relationship with recidivism (Trulson, DeLisi, & Marquart, 2011). Trulson et al. (2011) took a variety of official measures of institutional misconduct and found only a small effect of total misconducts on frequency of arrests with no effect on occurrence of arrest (dichotomous). They concluded that official misconducts held little promise as a predictor of post-release recidivism.

Lower level behaviours such as those described above (after Goldstein, 2002) may make an important contribution, if recorded.³ A cursory look at the homicide offences mentioned earlier shows that, had lower-level behaviour been used, it may have added a dimension of “legal foreseeability” (Borum & Reddy, 2001, p.379) to provoke clinical action. Anthony Rice, the man with a history of serious sexual offences against women, moved from a therapeutic community to an open prison, and a few weeks later concerns were expressed regarding overly familiar behaviour with a female member of staff. His

³ Based on focus groups with prison officers, Atkinson and Mann (2012) provide a number of reasons why Offence Paralleling Behaviours (OPBs) may not be reported, including normalisation, procedural factors, and individual staff factors. OPBs are behavioural patterns that are thought to parallel violence with respect to their psychological function.

explanation was that he was practicing his communication skills, as he had been taught. He was allowed to continue on his path to release. Damien Hanson, who was previously violent over a Rolex watch, had been studying the 'Sunday Times Rich list', according to items retrieved from his bedroom in the probation hostel. He had been following John Monkton's wife; a business card from her favourite shoe shop was also found among his possessions. Raoul Moat shot his ex-girlfriend and murdered Chris Brown who began dating her. He also seriously injured and blinded police officer David Rathband (who later committed suicide). Information had been passed from a trusted inmate to security in HMP Durham to say that Moat had made specific plans to shoot his ex- and her new boyfriend. The subsequent inquest found that information had not been used appropriately, although Moat's precise risk would still have been unknown ("Chris Brown inquest: Raoul Moat risk 'unknown'", 2013).

These types of behaviour may be very common but should certainly inform assessments of life sentenced offender behaviour (HMIP, 2013). The HMIP report into the management of such prisoners highlighted the case of a care worker who had "viciously" (p.18) murdered an elderly patient having manipulated his way into a position of trust. While in custody the same prisoner was showing similar signs of manipulation that went unchallenged. Second, it highlighted 'Joseph' who had stabbed a teacher in the neck and had thrown boiling water in the face of a nurse. The report points out that Joseph's risk management plan did not monitor his behaviour towards staff in custody. With serious offenders who are deemed clinically to be at high-risk of serious harm, we recommend on the basis of the research reviewed below, that risk management plans should be informed by the consistent application of a behaviour

monitoring protocol to examine the continuity of offence-related behaviour across community and custody including post-release.

Is offence behaviour reflected in prison behaviour?

We will now give some more detail on the Clark et al. (1993) study, also known as ‘The Wakefield study’ due to the name of the prison. The Wakefield study was the forerunner to the recidivism study described below. It is often referred to when discussing why prison behaviour is relevant, and together the two studies provide a sequence.

Clark et al. took a random 10% of life sentence prisoners in HMP Wakefield ($N=65$) and they asked two prison psychologists who had no prior experience of the cases to examine the risk behaviours leading up to the index offences. They were also asked to note down the consequent types of behaviours they might expect to observe in the prison setting. A further two independent prison psychologists then examined the prison records of the 65 cases to generate a list of actual prison behaviours. Thus for each prisoner they had a column of ‘predicted behaviours’ (PBs) and a column of ‘actual behaviours’ (ABs). A further two independent raters were then asked to judge how many of the PBs were later represented in the ABs, to give the rated percentage agreement (RPA). This was then compared with a dummy set of PB-AB pairs, and again the RPA was calculated. The results showed a significant difference with 65% of the real PBs being observed in the ABs, compared to approximately 20% concordance in the random PB-AB pairs. Furthermore they showed that the agreement between raters was high ($r=.29-.48$).

That research is now over 20 years old but is the basis for Offence-Paralleling Behaviour (Jones, 2004) which is yet to be empirically validated in terms of community outcomes, and, as is common in unaided clinical formulations, suffers from acknowledged problems of reliability and validity (Daffern, 2010).⁴ So the question remains: since offence-related behaviour can be identified in prison, whether prison behaviour can be identified in release behaviours.

Is prison offence-related behaviour reflected in post-release offending behaviour?

We called our behaviour monitoring system ADViSOR, not only because it would provide defensible advice on risk management, but because the police case management system was called the violent and sexual offender register (ViSOR). We had secured funding to evaluate the behaviour monitoring system in relation to the first cohort of police identified high-risk ViSOR nominals. Our plan was to use the prison officers to collect the behaviours, and then use the prison-based probation officers to harvest the data and take them to risk management meetings. The results are reported in full in the original publication (*[Identifying Reference A]*), but what now follows is a brief summary and discussion of these as an exposition of how clinical prediction can be improved by systematic observations of institutional behaviour in serious offenders.

⁴ It is important to point out that the Wakefield model is a different approach to OPB because the latter tries to identify functionally equivalent, but potentially offence-unrelated, behaviours. The Wakefield model focussed squarely on offence-related behaviours.

ADViSOR behaviour monitoring tool.

Our meetings with the prison officers produced eight key domains for monitoring: acquaintances, reading materials, contacts with the outside world, visits, behaviour with staff, behaviour with other prisoners, hobbies, and ‘any other behaviour of concern’.

We also added a ‘positive behaviours’ domain, on the basis that this would be important in assessment of whether there was capacity for control over sexual or other aggressive impulses (this would be useful for treatment recommendations). These domains were listed on a front-sheet on the wing history folder, to facilitate officers’ recording of behaviour. The types of offence-related behaviours officers expected to see were concerning. Our clinical experience notwithstanding, we were quite surprised at the nature of the behaviours that the officers said regularly occurred, including: offenders exchanging goods for sex; extortion and rape of vulnerable prisoners; exchanging pornography and violent magazines; borrowing violent material from the library; exchanging ideas about how to meet victims; and swapping contacts, e.g., women with vulnerable children. These behaviours were recorded on the wing history sheet (Figure 1) and then transferred onto a risk behaviour form (Figure 2) by the offender supervisor in the offender management unit.

[Figure 1 and Figure 2 about here]

Overview discussion of ADViSOR study sample, design, and findings.

We were interested in whether offence behaviour was being moderated in prison, or if a pathway to re-offending was being pursued. In our design we therefore wanted to examine whether there was evidence that the offender was controlling deviant interests, or whether he/she was encouraging them. We also wanted to record the

number of external contacts of each prisoner, and the relationship of these contacts to the offenders, e.g., ex-prisoner acquaintance, as we thought this could also indicate possible offence-related (or pro-social) motivations.

The ADViSOR group was a total cohort of high-risk sex offenders subject to Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA) released from the target prison to two probation areas during a one-year period ($n=25$). The comparison group was the total group of the same MAPPA profile offenders released from prisons nationally to the same two probation areas ($n=36$). Both groups were subject to MAPPA compulsory monitoring, but only the ADViSOR group was subject to the more detailed prison officer monitoring. We took the ADViSOR behaviours from our risk behaviour form, and we took MAPPA behaviours from the MAPP meeting minutes. For the comparison group we examined the MAPPA meeting minutes but also case records kept by the prison offender supervisor.

Our analysis correlated the frequency of each type of behaviour, positive and negative, in prison and the community.⁵ We then used the frequencies of negative and positive behaviour as predictors of re-offending outcome, defined by reconviction or recall to custody. We also inspected the behaviours of the ADViSOR monitoring cases qualitatively, with the help of three independent psychology assistants.

[Table 1 about here]

⁵ The prisoner behaviours in the community were followed up for one year from probation records and MAPPA minutes (independently, and ‘blind’ to the prison behaviour monitoring).

Results, reproduced in Table 1 above, showed strong correlations between behaviours across environments under ADViSOR, and small non-significant correlations between business-as-usual (MAPPA) prison behaviours and community behaviours (reconviction or reimprisonment). This small non-significant effect pertained under MAPPA in the cases of the target prison and those of the comparison prisons. Thus we did not see evidence that regular prison monitoring was better between the two groups, the difference appeared to relate to ADViSOR. Interestingly, there was a medium-sized correlation between ADViSOR and MAPPA within the target prison for negative behaviours, but not for positive, suggesting that some of the same negative behaviours were being detected by regular prison monitoring. Positive behaviours were likely unrelated because we coded ‘keeping out of trouble’ as positive, whereas this would not be seen as especially positive under usual recording if indeed it would even be identified without the systematic focus of ADViSOR.

How could we use this information, in a straightforward way, to classify offenders? The regression model based on the frequency of negative behaviours was able to predict re-imprisonment with the error rates shown in Table 2 below. Of the eight recidivists, only one was ‘missed’ (12%), while only one non-recidivist was falsely labelled (6%). The final column of Table 2 gives the sensitivity (88%) and specificity (94%). The specificity rates are particularly good, which indicates that the accuracy is not due simply to being more risk averse by making more ‘yes’ predictions. Meanwhile, the MAPPA meeting predictions on the same 25 cases, although statistically significant, do not show such good error rates, with one-half of recidivists missed (see Table 3). Thus with the caution of such few cases in mind, we can

tentatively see that the accuracy is coming more from the correct classification of the non-recidivists that had few or no low level negative behaviours.

[Table 2 and Table 3 about here]

Our second means of using the information was to examine offence-related continuity by assessing the similarity of behaviour across the situations pre- and post-release. Across three different raters, that showed good-to-excellent inter-rater agreement,⁶ the nature of the behaviours was similar or very similar 80% of the time. When the community behaviours were randomised, unbeknown to the raters, they rated them as similar or very similar just 32% of the time. The reason the inter-rater agreement was so high is apparent when we see the qualitative accounts of the behaviours. Case A did a lot of ‘business’ on the inside, he was constantly acquiring goods and then passing them on. The ADViSOR record showed that he had requested a wing change so that he could have a fresh start away from bad influences. The behaviour in the community was perfectly transferred: he got into £2,500 debt from taking out mobile phone contracts and then selling them on illegally. He then vanished – presumably for a ‘fresh start’. Case B was somewhat notorious in prison, although there were no official ‘serious incident reports’ raised. The record showed instances of bullying and threatening behaviour, and in the community he seized a fellow resident at his hostel by the neck. We have included Case C because it is a good example of targeted violence where an individual was at risk. The ADViSOR record picked up that the offender had written letters (but not posted) to his ex-wife. In the community he

⁶ Agreement between raters A and B was excellent ($k=.85$) but rater C’s agreement with A ($k=.71$) and B ($k=.67$) was good.

was arrested for an alleged assault on her. Case D was slightly reminiscent of Anthony Rice as this case made women prison officers feel uncomfortable, but no official complaint had been made. He sometimes touched them inappropriately, but apparently accidentally. In the community he was recalled to prison for staring at a woman and child while drunk, when it was in his post-release licence conditions not to approach children.

Conclusions on consistency of offence-related behaviour.

The above review of risk assessment and behavioural consistency pointed us towards the importance of anti-social lifestyle and sexual deviancy, which can both be measured behaviourally. Prison behaviour may be an expression of these underlying dynamic risk factors, and a manifestation of evolving offending behaviour. Institutional behaviour is not always held to be accurate, but this may be because it is situationally specific and not monitored across sufficient scenarios in the environment. Daily prison life as monitored by wing officers may be opportune for observing more natural behaviours with fewer attempts to evade detection.

The example shown here was of course limited by low numbers, and our current work extends this method on further samples. However when taken together with the previous study by Clark et al. (1993), the main finding is that prison behaviour, including lower-level coping behaviours, is indicative of community behaviours. The frequency of these behaviours may contribute to a risk probability, consistent with an 'aggregation' approach (Epstein, 1983), and increasing the testability of the prediction. The majority of items refer to anti-social lifestyle, such as bullying, 'horseplay' and disobeying instructions, or sexual deviancy, such as exchanging offending ideas.. This

work suggests the possibility of offence-related continuity among some offenders, depending on the accumulation of individualised evidence. This evidence-based approach is more tailored to individuals than that provided by current Actuarial Risk Assessments, and so may be a useful adjunct for adjusting risk in serious offender populations deemed at high-risk of serious harm. Future research in an interventions context may test the hypothesis that the approach can offer a validity check against what the offender is saying in supervision or in therapy, which may help prevent homicide and other serious further offences.

References

- Anderson, C. A., & Bushman, B. J. (2002). Human aggression. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53, 27-51.
- APA-Presidential-Task-Force-on-Evidence-Based-Practice. (2006). Evidence-Based Practice in Psychology. *American Psychologist*, 61(4), 271-285. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.61.4.271
- Atkinson, D. F., & Mann, R. E. (2012). Prison officers as observers of offence paralleling behaviours: an untapped resource? *The Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology*, 23(2), 139-155. doi: 10.1080/14789949.2012.668209
- Bonta, J., Law, M., & Hanson, R. K. (1998). The prediction of criminal and violent recidivism among mentally disordered offenders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 123(2), 123-142.
- Borum, R., & Reddy, M. (2001). Assessing violence risk in Tarasoff situations: a fact-based model of inquiry. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 19(3), 375-385.
- Bukstel, L. H., & Kilmann, P. R. (1980). Psychological effects of imprisonment on confined individuals. *Psychological Bulletin*, 88, 469-493.
- Buss, D. M., & Craik, K. H. (1983). The act frequency approach to personality. *Psychological Review*, 90(2), 105-126. doi: 10.1037/0033-295x.90.2.105
- Campbell, T. W. (2000). Sexual predator evaluations and phrenology: considering issues of evidentiary reliability. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 18(1), 111-130. doi: 10.1002/(sici)1099-0798(200001/02)18:1<111::aid-bsl382>3.0.co;2-p
- Canter, D. (1995). The psychology of offender profiling. In R. Bull & D. Carson (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology in legal contexts* (pp. 343-355). Chichester, UK: Wiley.

"Chris Brown inquest: Raoul Moat risk 'unknown'" (2013, December 11). Chris Brown inquest: Raoul Moat risk 'unknown'. *BBC News Tyne & Wear*. Retrieved from <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-tyne-25336375>

Clark, D. A., Fisher, M. J., & McDougall, C. (1993). A new methodology for assessing the level of risk in incarcerated offenders. *British Journal of Criminology*, 33(3), 436-448.

Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112 (1), 155-159.

Daffern, M. (2010). A structured cognitive-behavioural approach to the assessment and treatment of violent offenders using offence-paralleling behaviour. In M. Daffern, L. Jones, & J. Shine (Eds.), *Offence paralleling behaviour: A case formulation approach to offender assessment and intervention* (pp.105-120). Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals Inc. (1993), 113S. Ct. 2786.

Epstein, S. (1983). The stability of confusion: A reply to Mischel and Peake. *Psychological Review*, 90(2), 179-184. doi: 10.1037/0033-295x.90.2.179

Gendreau, P., Little, T., and Goggin, C. (1996). A meta-analysis of the predictors of adult offender recidivism: What works! *Criminology*, 34(4), 575-607.

Goldstein, A. P. (2002). Low-Level Aggression: Definition, Escalation, Intervention. In J. McGuire (Ed.), *Offender Rehabilitation and Treatment* (pp. 167-192): John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

Greenall, P. V., & Richardson, C. (2015). Adult Male-on-Female Stranger Sexual Homicide: A Descriptive (Baseline) Study From Great Britain. *Homicide Studies*, 19(3), 237-256. doi: 10.1177/1088767914530555

- Harris, G. T., & Rice, M. E. (2015). Progress in violence risk assessment and communication: Hypothesis versus evidence. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 33, 128-135. doi: 10.1002/bsl.2157
- Hanson, R. K., & Morton-Bourgon, K. E. (2005). The characteristics of persistent sexual offenders: a meta-analysis of recidivism studies. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 73(6), 1154-1163. doi: 10.1037/0022-006X.73.6.1154
- Hanson, R. K., & Morton-Bourgon, K. E. (2009). The accuracy of recidivism risk assessments for sexual offenders: a meta-analysis of 118 prediction studies. *Psychological Assessment*, 21(1), 1-21. doi: 10.1037/a0014421
- Heil, P., Harrison, L., English, K., & Ahlmeyer, S. (2009). Is prison sexual offending indicative of community risk? *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 36(9), 892-908. doi: 10.1177/0093854809338989
- Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation - HMIP (2006a). *An independent review of a serious further offence case: Anthony Rice*. London: Crown Copyright. Retrieved from <http://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/probation/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2014/03/anthonyricereport-rps.pdf>
- Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation - HMIP (2006b). *An independent review of a serious further offence case: Damien Hanson and Elliot White*. London: Crown Copyright. Retrieved from <http://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/probation/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2014/03/hansonandwhitereview-rps.pdf>
- Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation - HMIP (2013). *A joint inspection of life sentence prisoners* (Thematic Inspection Report, 12 September 2013). Retrieved from

http://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprobation/inspections/a-joint-inspection-of-life-sentence-prisoners/#.U8-sfqz_nTp

Jones, L. (2004). Offence Paralleling Behaviour (OPB) as a Framework for Assessment and Interventions with Offenders *Applying Psychology to Forensic Practice* (pp. 34-63): Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1973). On the psychology of prediction. *Psychological Review*, 80, 237-251.

Liem, M. (2013). Homicide offender recidivism: A review of the literature. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 18(1), 19-25.

McDougall, C., Pearson, D. A. S., Willoughby, H., & Bowles, R. (2013). Evaluation of the ADViSOR project: Cross-situational behaviour monitoring of high risk offenders in prison and the community. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 18 (2), 205-228. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8333.2012.02059.x

Mischel, W., & Shoda, Y. (1995). A cognitive-affective system of personality: Reconceptualising situations, dispositions, dynamics, and invariance in personality structure. *Psychological Review*, 102 (2), 246-268.

Monahan, J. (1981). *Predicting violent behavior: An assessment of clinical techniques*. Beverley Hills, CA: Sage.

Mulvey, E. P., & Lidz, C. W. (1985). Back to basics - a critical analysis of dangerousness research in a new legal environment. *Law and Human Behavior*, 9(2), 209-219. doi: Doi 10.1007/Bf01067052

National Offender Management Service - NOMS (2009). *Investigation into the issues arising from the serious further offence review: Dano Sonnex*. London: Crown

Copyright. Retrieved from <http://www.justice.gov.uk/news/docs/serious-further-offence-review-sonnex-web.pdf>

Olweus, D. (1980). The consistency issue in personality psychology revisited--with special reference to aggression. *The British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 19(Pt 4), 377-390.

Serin, R. C., Lloyd, C. D., Helmus, L., Derkzen, D. M., & Luong, D. (2013). Does intra-individual change predict offender recidivism? Searching for the Holy Grail in assessing offender change. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 18(1), 32-53. doi: [10.1016/j.avb.2012.09.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2012.09.002)

Tarasoff v. Regents of the University of California (1976) 17 Cal3d 425, 551 P.2d 334.

Trulson, C. R., DeLisi, M., & Marquart, J. W. (2011). Institutional Misconduct, Delinquent Background, and Rearrest Frequency Among Serious and Violent Delinquent Offenders. *Crime & Delinquency*, 57(5), 709-731. doi: 10.1177/0011128709340224

Yang, M., Wong, S. C. P., & Coid, J. (2010). The efficacy of violence prediction: A meta-analytic comparison of nine risk assessment tools. *Psychological Bulletin*, 136(5), 740-767.

Zamble, E., & Porporino, F. (1990). Coping, imprisonment, and rehabilitation: Some data and their implications. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 17, 53-70.

TYPES OF INFORMATION TO REPORT ON THE MONITORING FORM

We are interested in identifying behaviour in prison which is related to offence behaviour, so that we can provide information on level of risk, and advise on likely behaviour in the community. Please report on the *History Sheet* evidence of any relevant behaviour, examples of which are shown below. This will be followed up and collated by Offender Supervisors for use in Inter-departmental Public Protection Meetings and MAPPA meetings.

<p><i>Acquaintances</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Close friendship with offenders with similar offences ▪ Always mixes with sex offenders ▪ Grooming of other prisoners ▪ Sexual relationship with other prisoner/s ▪ Details of cell-mate 	<p><i>Behaviour with other prisoners</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Intimidating behaviour towards other prisoners (including violence/rape) ▪ Sexual behaviour for payment ▪ Victimised by other prisoners - injuries ▪ Bullying – lack of, or lots of personal belongings
<p><i>Behaviour in Work / Education</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Involved in offence-related discussion with other prisoners ▪ Inappropriate comments to instructor/teacher ▪ Inappropriate behaviour with teachers ▪ Selects unlikely reading materials ▪ Attempted grooming of teachers/instructors ▪ Interested in learning about skills related to own offending – e.g. internet access, making soft toys, etc. 	<p><i>Reading / Photographic Materials</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pornographic material ▪ Unlikely reading material, such as women's magazines, material with pictures of children, young girls or boys, etc, catalogues ▪ Other offender's depositions ▪ Pictures and photos of concern on pin-board
<p><i>Hobbies / Pastimes</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Making soft toys ▪ Choice of TV – Interest in violent videos or video-games – playstation, etc. ▪ 'Fetish' like behaviours (e.g. collecting underwear) ▪ Phone sex / compulsive masturbation ▪ Excessive use of gym ▪ 'Legitimate' avoidance of Offending Behaviour Programmes 	<p><i>Contacts with outside world (by letter or phone)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In touch with ex-prisoners / sex offenders ▪ Wide range of contacts ▪ Contacts with children ▪ Female pen-friends / grooming ▪ Postal orders and transfers of money ▪ Lots of small amounts of money to one address ▪ Contact with minority groups, including religious
<p><i>Visits</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Drug trafficking ▪ Inappropriate behaviour with visitor/s ▪ Watching children on visits ▪ Excessive applications to see children, e.g. nephews / nieces ▪ Requests to see partner's children 	<p><i>Behaviour with staff</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeks out female members of staff or specific members of staff ▪ Grooming behaviour ▪ Tries to 'bend the rules' ▪ Seeks favours ▪ Exposes self (even if seemingly by accident) ▪ Excessive use of requests / complaints
<p><i>Any other behaviour that concerns you</i></p> <p>Please contact offender supervisor</p>	<p><i>Positive behaviours related to offending</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Avoiding offenders with similar offences ▪ Evidence of controlling offence related interests ▪ Positive alternative behaviours ▪ Constructive plans for release

Figure 1. ADViSOR wing information sheet

OFFENDER SUPERVISOR PRISON BEHAVIOUR FORM

(ONLY FILL IN RELEVANT SECTIONS)

Release Date

Name of Offender	DOB
Name of Offender Supervisor	PNC No
	Name of Offender Manager
Signature	Today's date xx / xx / xxxx

1. Acquaintances		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Close friendship with offenders with similar offences ▪ Always mixes with sex offenders ▪ Grooming of other prisoners ▪ Sexual relationship with other prisoner/s ▪ Details of cell-mate
Behaviour with acquaintances causing concern – (include evidence) Give 2 examples if possible		
1)		
2)		
Likely behaviour on release indicated by behaviour with acquaintances		
BEHAVIOUR IN HOSTEL/APPROVED PREMISES (Complete if applicable)		
COMPLETED BY OFFENDER MANAGER AFTER RELEASE (Describe)	Behaviour evident in first 3 months	YES/NO

Figure 2. ADViSOR offence-related behaviour monitoring form (for item 1)

Tables

Table 1

Correlations Between Prison and Community Behaviours

Prison	Monitoring Group	Behaviour	Frequency, <i>M</i> (SD)		Correlation, <i>r</i>
			Prison	Community	
Target	ADViSOR	negative	4.56 (4.01) ^a	2.56 (2.80)	.55**
Target	MAPPA	negative	2.16 (3.68) ^a		.22
Comparison	MAPPA	negative	1.22 (2.80)	2.56 (2.98)	.23
Target	ADViSOR	positive	2.76 (1.67)	2.96 (2.51)	.56**
Target	MAPPA	positive	1.04 (1.88)		.17
Comparison	MAPPA	positive	1.22 (1.10)	1.44 (1.34)	.25

Note. The target prison sample has a single frequency for community positive behaviours and for community negative behaviours; ^a denotes correlated within-prison measures

($r=.45$, $p=.023$). * $p<.05$

** $p<.01$

*** $p<.001$

Table 2

Predictions of Re-imprisonment by Frequency of ADViSOR Negative Behaviour

	PREDICT NO	PREDICT YES	% CORRECT
ACTUAL NO	16	1	94
ACTUAL YES	1	7	88
TOTAL			92

Table 3

Predictions of Re-imprisonment by Frequency of MAPPA Negative Behaviour

	PREDICT NO	PREDICT YES	% CORRECT
ACTUAL NO	15	2	88
ACTUAL YES	4	4	50
TOTAL			76