



MALMÖ HÖGSKOLA
FAKULTETEN FÖR
HÄLSA OCH SAMHÄLLE

PAROLE IN SWEDEN AND CANADA

A CROSS-CULTURAL REVIEW OF RISK AND
ELECTRONIC MONITORING PAROLE
PRACTICES

RHODRI BASSETT

Thesis in criminology
60 credits
Criminology, master program
May 2016

Malmö University
Health and society
205 06

PAROLE IN SWEDEN AND CANADA

A CROSS-CULTURAL REVIEW OF RISK AND ELECTRONIC MONITORING PAROLE PRACTICES

RHODRI BASSETT

Bassett, R. Parole in Sweden and Canada. A cross-cultural review of risk and electronic monitoring parole practices. *Degree project in criminology, 15 Credits*. Malmö University: Faculty of Health and Society, Department of Criminology, 2016.

Over the past few decades, new philosophies and technologies have impacted parole around the world. Most notably, predicting recidivism through risk assessments has altered the way in which clients are perceived, while electronic monitoring technology has granted the possibility of constant supervision. Due to these recent changes, there are concerns that countries with traditionally rehabilitative parole systems will become more punitive and supervisory. A thematic and metasynthetic review of two countries with rehabilitative parole systems, Sweden and Canada, revealed that risk and electronic monitoring have been integrated to serve balanced agendas that both care for and control clients.

Keywords: balanced, Canada, care, control, electronic monitoring, risk, parole, Sweden.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I would like to thank my supervisor, Peter Lindström, for his sincere encouragement and confidence throughout this thesis. I'd also like to thank the friends that I have made in Malmö and my family that have reminded me to balance work and leisure. Also, a special thanks to Erik Lingley and Katie Brooks for being constant sources of motivation and support from across an ocean and a sea.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Defining parole.....	1
1.2 Parole officer role orientations and attitudes.....	2
2. RESEARCH AIMS	3
3. METHOD AND ETHICS	4
4. BACKGROUND.....	6
4.1 Sweden's correctional history	6
4.2 Sweden's parole system	8
4.3 Canada's correctional history.....	9
4.4 Canada's parole system.....	12
5. RISK ASSESSMENT	13
5.1 Canadian leadership in Risk-Need-Responsivity	14
5.2 Risk assessment tools	15
5.3 Swedish pre-sentence reports and resistance to risk	15
5.4 Canadian pre-sentence reports and acceptance of risk	16
6. ELECTRONIC MONITORING	18
6.1 Swedish leadership in electronic monitoring	19
6.2 Canadian caution towards electronic monitoring	21
7. RESULTS	23
7.1 Limitations.....	24
8. FUTURE IMPLICATIONS.....	25
9. CONCLUSION	26
REFERENCES.....	28

1. INTRODUCTION

Prisons can be harmful environments for an inmate as they are sources of: isolation from family and friends, criminal capital through criminogenic relationships with other inmates, and physical or psychological trauma (Bayer et al., 2003; Wolfe et al., 2007; Cochran & Mears, 2013). Some may believe that the end of a prison sentence is the best part, as an inmate can simply walk out the doors of the prison and can live a crime-free life, but this is not the case for the majority of prisoners. Rather, exiting prison, which is a place of structure and dependency, can spur on even more challenges such as: limited job opportunities, no social support and resisting old habits like drugs and alcohol (Aday 1976; Jarred 2000). To alleviate these and other challenges, the parole system helps offenders reintegrate back into society and provides resources to give them the best chance of becoming law abiding citizens.

1.1 Defining parole

The reality of any criminal justice system is that the majority of imprisoned offenders will eventually be released (Petersilia, 2004). While some systems release offenders without supervision, most use parole to supervise, rehabilitate and reintegrate offenders (Justice Policy Institute, 2011). Parole refers to the process by which an offender is released from prison and serves the remainder of their sentence being supervised by a parole officer in the community (Parole Board of Canada, 2015). Offenders on parole are often called *parolees* or *clients*. While there may be political undertones to this language, the thesis uses these terms interchangeably, depending on the language used in the research. The goals of parole vary between criminal justice systems, but most use it as a humane way to promote desistance within a community setting and an economically favourable alternative to prolonged imprisonment (Healy, 2012).

The way in which parole takes form has changed over time and place mostly because perspectives of what parole ought to be are subject to political, economic and cultural trends. These goals of parole are often categorized into being care or control-oriented and, more broadly, relate to rehabilitative or punitive correctional philosophies. A rehabilitative correctional system is one in which offenders are treated to prevent recidivism and to reintegrate them as law-abiding citizens (Lipsey & Cullen, 2007). Punitive correctional systems use the incarceration period as a way to punish and control offenders (ibid). While there is research suggesting that some North American and European countries have shifted towards punitive models lately, Sweden and Canada are still perceived as rehabilitative correctional systems (Healy, 2012).

Within the past few decades, the Swedish and Canadian parole systems have been affected by the rise of offender risk assessments and advancing electronic monitoring technology (EM). Risk assessments are evaluations that determine the likelihood of reoffending and can be written either with discretion in a narrative format or in exact calculations via actuarial assessments (Bonta et al., 1990). EM refers to the process of using wearable tracking devices to follow and record the whereabouts of offenders in communities (Nellis & Bunderfeldt, 2013). Risk assessments and EM have created

managerial parole systems, within which the concept of *managing offenders* is central (Persson & Svensson, 2011). There is a need to explore whether risk assessment and EM have been adapted to the pre-existing care/rehabilitative models, have spurred more control/punitive practices, or serve balanced purposes (Hannah-Moffat, 2004; Persson & Svensson, 2011).

1.2 Parole officer role orientations and attitudes

Perhaps the most challenging aspect of being a parole officer is fulfilling a dual role of both law enforcement and social caseworker; the same can be said for probation officers (Persson & Svensson, 2011). Understanding how parole officers view their role and relationship to clients can be as important as studying the behaviour of parolees. Research suggests that adopting neither a purely care or control role orientation, but an equal balance, leads to positive officer-client relationships that have proven to reduce recidivism (Paparozzi & Gendreau, 2005). Encouragingly, research shows that role orientations can be altered through training, which means that parole officers can change their outlook to give their clients the best chance of exiting a criminal lifestyle (Fulton et al., 1997).

The role of a parole officer is an emotionally taxing job. Officers deal with difficult clients and make challenging decisions, like notifying a manager of breached conditions and must advocate the client's return to prison. Parole officers also feel overwhelming responsibility to protect citizens in the community, which can lead to over-supervising low-risk clients or refusing pro-social activities to high-risk clients in misguided attempts to prevent recidivism (Lewis et al., 2012). These emotional demands can cause 'burnout', a state of emotional and physical exhaustion caused by prolonged stress, as well as negative impacts on officers' psychological well-being (Whitehead & Lindquist, 1985; Lewis et al., 2012; Gayman & Bradley, 2013). Lewis et al. (2012) found that officers who had clients commit suicide, recidivate violently, or assault them on duty experienced traumatic stress and burnout. The authors proposed that stress management programs, higher education and providing periodic stress assessments could mitigate the effects of work-related stressors and enhance officers' abilities to cope with future stressful events (Lewis et al., 2012). Gayman and Bradley (2013) found that role conflict was linked to both burnout, as well as depressive symptoms. These and other studies uphold the notion that parole officers need training and resources to help them keep a balanced approach to the role, as it will not only improve officer-client relationships and promote desistance, but will lead to healthier officers with lower employment turnover.

As previously mentioned, both Sweden and Canada have become more risk-oriented in their approach to parole. It is unclear whether officers in each country have altered their role orientation to match the new risk and managerial landscape, or whether they have met this shift with resistance. There is evidence suggesting that officer role orientations do not always align with the philosophy of their criminal justice systems (Persson & Svensson, 2011). This misalignment is often attributed to the state's high demands and parole officers' limited time and resources or conflicting attitudes towards clients' needs (Samra-Grewal & Roesch, 2000; Persson & Svensson, 2011). It stands to reason that the best parole system is one in which parole officers and the

organizations that employ them operate with the same goals and expectations for clients. If an ideological misalignment exists, then either institutional reorganization or officer training should be used in order to make a directed and purposeful parole system.

One way that officer orientations have been measured has been through the exploration of officer attitudes, either towards clients, the parole system they operate within, or the legal system in general. Researchers have suggested that since parole officers get a large degree of freedom in how they actually *do* parole, the techniques they use should reflect their parole attitudes (Jones & Kerbs, 2007; Rokkan et al., 2015). Modes of data collection have varied from both quantitative surveys to qualitative interviews and diaries, which means that there is a diverse and growing amount of parole officer-based research (Fulton et al. 1997; Rokkan et al., 2015).

There has been a lack of research for both Sweden and Canada that explicitly states the direction that their respective parole systems aim to move toward. With the shift towards managerialism and risk assessment, as well as the use of EM being evident in current research and practices, it is unclear whether care, control or balanced principles are still maintained among Swedish and Canadian parole officers. At first glance, risk assessment and EM may appear to be dehumanizing and control-oriented, with risk assessments reducing a client's identity to a number and EM allowing for every movement to be monitored. By reviewing literature that separately evaluates how parole officers in Sweden and Canada have reacted to risk-based and EM demands of their national parole institutions, the current state of parole can be illustrated and its future direction can be hypothesized.

2. RESEARCH AIMS

Almost all of the literature in this thesis had parole officers, not clients, as the target group of interest, which allowed for profiles of Swedish and Canadian parole officers to be discussed. Cross-cultural comparisons of parole is not a new phenomenon, with Canada often being compared to the U.K. and U.S., and Sweden often being compared to the U.K. and other Scandinavian countries (Hornum, 1988; Petrunik, 2002; Nellis & Bungerfeldt, 2013). This work is the first however, to compare Sweden and Canada's parole services exclusively. Selecting these two countries provides a valuable comparative study as extant literature has a tendency to compare countries with polarized penological philosophies, which identifies systemic differences. Sweden and Canada have both been impacted by the emergence of risk assessment/managerialism and have incorporated EM into their parole systems to varying degrees. This thesis describes the results of a literature review that compares how Swedish and Canadian parole officers have incorporated or resisted risk assessments and EM in their parole practices.

There are two main research aims for this thesis:

- To compare how Sweden and Canada have incorporated risk and EM into their parole systems.
- To review whether risk and EM serve care, control or balanced parole interests in Sweden and Canada.

First, the thesis will recount Sweden and Canada's correctional histories and their development of parole. Second, the thesis will critically analyze literature pertaining to officer attitudes towards the emergence of managerialism and risk assessments in parole. Third, the thesis will discuss the emergence of and officer attitudes towards EM. The thesis will then consider the future implications of current parole practices in Sweden and Canada. Limitations of the thesis will also be discussed, followed by a conclusion.

3. METHOD AND ETHICS

The thesis is a review of current knowledge of Swedish and Canadian risk-oriented and EM parole practices. The studies reviewed in the thesis were based on Swedish or Canadian parole officers unless expressed otherwise. A blend of thematic review and metasynthesis were selected as a method of collection and analysis. Literature was gathered and considered on the basis of themes relevant to the research aims, such as: parole, risk assessment, electronic monitoring, care and control (See Table 1 for full list of keywords). These terms can be quite broad, so discretion was used in the search process to determine which research was suitable and relevant. For example, predicting risk has extended into many fields of research, such as healthcare and commerce. It should also be noted that synonyms of keywords were included since Swedish and Canadian researchers may refer to the same topic in different ways (i.e. electronic monitoring is more common in Canada as opposed to electronic tagging Sweden).

Metasynthesis is "a process that enables researchers to identify a specific research question and then search for, select, appraise, summarize, and combine qualitative evidence to address the research [aims]" (Erwin et al., 2011, p.186). Metasynthesis was used to produce a fluid narrative throughout the thesis, which in conjunction with thematic review principles shaped the selection process. While metasynthesis is intended for qualitative studies, quantitative research was included, such as studies that scored parole attitudes and calculated risk. The combination of thematic review and metasynthesis ultimately provided the best way to achieve the research aims of the thesis.

<i>Table 1. Keywords used to collect and review research.</i>		
Role Type	Attitude	Technique
Caseworker/Social Welfare	Care Rehabilitate Rehabilitation Reintegrate Reintegration Welfare	Intervention Need Responsivity Social programming Motivational Interviewing
Officer/Enforcement	Control Management Punish Punitive Supervise Supervision	Electronic Monitoring Electronic Tagging Reassessment Risk Risk Assessment
*Country-specific keywords were also used, such as: Sweden, Swedish, Kriminalvården, Swedish Prison and Probation Service, Canada, Canadian and Correctional Service Canada. The terms balanced, dual-role and dualistic were also used. All terms were used in conjunction with 'parole'.		

The majority of literature included in the thesis was found using Malmö University's online library. The keywords mentioned above were then included in the summons search engine. Access to various journals and databases through the Malmö University library portal also made it possible to consider new and relevant research. Due to the nature of the thesis, government statistics, evaluation reports, newspaper articles, parliamentary meetings and information only accessible through organizational websites also play an integral part in understanding the history and organizational structure of parole in Sweden and Canada. Including background information on Sweden and Canada's correctional histories required that no date range be set in the collection process.

A review of the current state of parole in each country is valuable when considered independently and even more so when compared cross-culturally. A cross-cultural comparison could be valuable to both Swedish and Canadian parole officers, managers and policy-makers, since considering alternative methods in a similar system may provoke innovation in future parole practices. By comparing how parole is performed in two countries with almost identical legal structures, culturally based attitudes towards risk assessment and EM can be understood, rather than identifying systemic differences in countries that are structurally incompatible. This thesis is also beneficial to the field of criminology in general, as it is an original cross-comparative work that may provoke further research or collaboration in Sweden and Canada, or in other countries with complimentary parole systems. Finally, any research that can lead to the advancement of successful parole practices has societal benefits ranging from improved public safety to economically sustainable correctional practices.

There are weaknesses of doing cross-cultural comparisons that must also be accounted for. First, the lack of standardized tools and measurements between countries makes exact comparisons difficult. Cross-cultural comparisons, in almost any field, ought to be welcome should standardized tools be used in both cultures in order to form an exact comparison. The lack of standardized measures to measure different aspects of parole in Sweden and Canada means that a general understanding of each country's parole system must be compared. Second, the inability to read the national language of a country included in a cross-cultural comparison is a weakness in any area of research. The limited access to only research written in English will be discussed later in the thesis, but it is noteworthy at this point as well.

Since the thesis took the form of a literature review and no new data were collected, no ethical approval was needed. Instead, ethics were considered when discussing sensitive topics, such as forced sterilization and victim safety.

4. BACKGROUND

4.1 Sweden's correctional history

Parole in Sweden falls under a specific agency within the Ministry of Justice known as the Swedish Prison and Probation Service and is publically funded with 8.1 billion Swedish kronor, or approximately 1.2 billion Canadian dollars (Swedish Prison and Probation Service, 2016a). The Ministry of Justice also includes police, victim compensation, courts, public prosecution and crime prevention research (Ministry of Justice, 2015). The SPPS operates nationally and blends parole and probation into one category, which means that officers' cases consist of offenders both on probation and parole (*ibid*). Studying a country like Sweden with a national parole and probation system has produced generalizable results on a national scale, rather than on a regional one, which makes past research particularly poignant for cross-cultural comparison.

Before moving into specific details about current parole practices, the Swedish correctional system in general must be contextualized. Swedish correctional services have historically been largely influenced by French social defense theory; a theory in which criminology influences both policy-making and practice (Hamai et al., 1992 as cited by Nellis & Bungerfeldt, 2013). From a social defense theoretical perspective, criminology and criminal law collaboratively operate to benefit the individual and society; a shift that began in most Scandinavian countries circa 1948 (Canals, 1960). Sweden in particular has since been viewed as a 'liberal utopia' with innovative and humane correctional practices and philosophies (Nellis & Bungerfeldt, 2013). Sweden also has famously small incarceration rates, currently with 55 prisoners per 100,000 citizens, compared to 106 per 100,000 in Canada, or 478 per 100,000 in the U.S., for example (Carson, 2014; Institute for Criminal Policy Research, 2015; Statistics Canada, 2015). Sweden also has some of the shortest prison sentences in any criminal justice system around the world, with accessible and popular alternatives to incarceration, as seen in the increased use of electronic monitoring and forms of

community sentencing and supervision (Marklund & Holmberg, 2009; Nellis & Bunkerfeldt, 2013). Alternative community sentences, rehabilitative resources in prisons, as well as the use of effective reintegration and post-release plans are not only to keep the current Swedish prison population low, but to provide long-term pathways to desistance (Marklund & Holmberg, 2009).

Sweden, like virtually every other state, has not had a purely punitive or rehabilitative correctional landscape throughout recent history. Rather, the current state of any correctional service should be understood as temporally situated, with many confounding factors that reflect social milieu and political shifts. For instance, many Western countries adopted eugenic-inspired sterilization and castration legislation from 1929 to the mid-1950s (Wessel, 2015). In Sweden however, sterilization and castration legislation was enacted under the guise of humanitarianism and social welfare rather than from a purely eugenic perspective, which had taken hold of most Western societies (*ibid*). Sterilization predominantly targeted homosexual females and some male sexual offenders. Castration was largely used among sex offenders in order to quell dangerous sexual tendencies and could be performed on offenders over the age of 21, or of any age on mentally ill offenders (*ibid*). The last castrations and sterilizations were performed in Sweden in the 1950s and legislation was formally repealed in the 1970s. Despite this legislation, Sweden still had a growing reputation of being a leader in humane treatment and progressive rehabilitative policies.

A less extreme example of Sweden's tumultuous correctional history was from 1991-1994, in which the newly elected conservative government tightened drug laws and reduced eligibility for parole. Sweden moved from being seen as a purely rehabilitative correctional environment that was 'soft on crime' towards a just deserts model (Nellis & Bunkerfeldt, 2013). While the just deserts model may sound retributive and more punitive in nature, it merely refers to a penal philosophy that the "perceived gravity of the offence, or the 'penal value', is the most important factor in the decision of an appropriate sanction for the crime" (Lindström & Leijonram, 2007, p.559). It should be noted that present Swedish correctional philosophies aim to be immune to future social and political shifts by maintaining long-term approaches to rehabilitation and detention. As Nils Öberg, the director-general of the SPPS stated, "regardless of what public opinion may be at one time, ... you have to take a long-term perspective. The system ... is set up to implement long-term strategies and stick to them" (James, 2014, paragraph 10). Öberg's comments speak to the maintenance of stable correctional plans that fulfill long-term aims that persist regardless of cultural or political shifts. With a structure in place to maintain a stable correctional environment, Öberg also stated that the role of prison staff "is not to punish. The punishment is [an offender's] prison sentence: they have been deprived of their freedom" (James, 2014, paragraph 1). Prison not being a place of punishment is a very liberal notion that not many other countries express, with the philosophy that prisoners are stripped of their freedom, not their humanity. This philosophy refers to the Prison Treatment Act of 1945 that stated that the prison experience itself should not be a punishment, and which reiterates the maintenance of a stable and directed correctional system in Sweden (Lindström & Leijonram, 2007). These types of comments express how the SPPS hold individuals accountable using the just deserts

model, while seeking long-term rehabilitative results. While Sweden is by no means viewed as having a harsh punitive criminal justice system, it should be understood that their rehabilitative approach is not as soft or utopic as illustrated in the past.

4.2 Sweden's parole system

Now that the modern ethos of Swedish corrections has been accounted for, the more precise topic of parole can be discussed. As previously mentioned, parole and probation are grouped into one profession, although the types of sentences parolees and probationers serve differ. Parole refers to mandatory release and community supervision of a prisoner once two-thirds of their prison sentence has been served, while probation refers to an alternative sentence to prison altogether through community supervision and usually involves either volunteering or treatment (Holmberg et al., 2012). Police, clergymen, laymen working within the municipal government and other similar professionals were the first to supervise offenders in the community due to the 1918 Conditional Sentence Act, followed by its amendment in 1939 (Lindholm & Bishop, 2008). By 1942, Sweden had appointed its first four full-time parole officers, which increased to 13 within three years (ibid). It took 20 years after creating the parole officer profession before officers were available in all regions of Sweden (ibid).

Swedish parole and probation has always consisted of both professionals and philanthropic volunteers; a practice that is continued today with the supervision of over 40% probationers and parolees being assisted by lay supervisors (Kalmthout & Durnescu, 2008; Lindholm & Bishop, 2008). Layman supervisors are used to check on offenders either voluntarily or for a small fee. Including volunteers in the parole process is immensely beneficial for the SPPS's for several reasons. From the layman's perspective, volunteering gets them involved in the Swedish legal system and helps to build a sense of community responsibility for crime (Ministry of Justice, 1997). Offenders also benefit from having layman supervisors as these volunteers can help to fill a more humanized, rather than institutionalized, role in the parole process by providing weekly contact outside of a correctional office setting while providing social support (Holmberg et al., 2012). There are cases however within which including a layman supervisor is unacceptable, such as offenders with a mental illness, abusive histories or involvement in criminal organizations (ibid). Including layman supervisors is also immensely beneficial for the SPPS as it not only is a cost-effective way to supervise offenders, but also lightens the workload of full-time parole officers (ibid).

Layman parole officers tend to be either from social work professions or are 'blue-collar' workers and are sometimes known to the client. A screening process is used to ensure that there is no sort of dependency dynamic between officers and clients with pre-existing relationships, which is why family members are usually excluded from consideration (Holmberg et al., 2012). The duties that these volunteers perform consist of weekly checks in the form of social visits, usually by going for a walk or having coffee (ibid). In order to effectively set and achieve parole objectives, the professional probation officer, the layman officer and client maintain communication by meeting together at least once every three weeks (ibid). The inclusion of layman

supervisors can be seen as achieving both care and control aspects of parole. Layman supervisors establish meaningful relationships with offenders to promote social rehabilitation and communication, which aligns with care-based principles (ibid). Alternatively, layman supervisors see clients on a more regular basis than parole officers, so they are valuable agents of surveillance and by definition, control (ibid). It should be noted that there are no findings to suggest that layman supervisors impact crime prevention by encouraging desistance, however parolees have expressed their gratitude for the friendship and understanding that most layman supervisors provide (ibid).

There are 43 probation and parole offices across Sweden that work with roughly 14,000 parolees and probationers per year, which is over three times more than the current prison population of 4,500 (Swedish Prison and Probation Service, 2016b). There are three kinds of clients that can fall under the care of parole officers: *conditional sentences, probation, and parole*. Courts can offer *conditional sentences*, which is a two-year period within which as long as no further crimes are committed, the offender will not be imprisoned (Holmberg et al., 2012). Conditional sentences are most common among first-time low-risk offenders that do not require intensive or formal supervision (ibid).

Courts can also order an offender to go on *probation*, which like a conditional sentence is an alternative to prison. Probation consists of more intensive and formal supervision, with mandatory meetings (Holmberg et al., 2012). With the aid of social services and probation officers, courts can also establish probation conditions that the offender must meet and this is known as contract treatment (ibid). For example, if an offender was charged with an alcohol-related offence, the offender may have to go substance abuse meetings. The goal of the contract treatment of probationers is to treat abuse, dependency, or some other factor that contributed to the original offence (ibid).

The third type of clients that interact with probation officers are those on *conditional release*. Conditional release is synonymous with parole, which is a French word meaning *word of honour*, as parole is a pledge that a prisoner makes to not bear arms or escape the country upon being conditionally released (Morieux, 2013). Parolees are offenders that spend part-time or full-time outside of prison for the remaining third of their sentence (Holmberg et al., 2012). Parolees require reintegration strategies as well as continued supervision in order to help them become a functioning and law-abiding citizen (ibid). Since the SPPS combines parole and probation into one service, with officers supervising both probationers and parolees, most Swedish research does not distinguish one kind of client from another and this should be kept in mind when reviewing the literature.

4.3 Canada's correctional history

Like Sweden, the Canadian parole system falls under the jurisdiction of the federal government. While Sweden has one unified agency to dictate parole regulations, the SPPS, Canada has the Department of Public Safety, which grants decision-making

powers to the Parole Board of Canada (PBC) and appoints supervision through Correctional Service Canada (CSC). CSC is publically funded with an annual budget of 1.8 billion Canadian dollars, or approximately 11.4 billion Swedish kronor. Canada's national correctional budget is only half a billion dollars more than Sweden's despite having almost double the amount of incarcerated inmates, which suggests that parole officers and offenders in Sweden have more resources at their disposal than in Canada (Public Safety Canada, 2010). With parole being a national matter, only offenders that have been sentenced to two or more years are eligible for parole, while shorter sentences are served in provincial facilities, often mixed with some sort of probation (Parole Board of Canada, 2015). Unlike the SPPS, probation officers and parole officers are similar but distinct professions within CSC. This distinction is somewhat complex as probation is a provincial matter and parole is national, yet both types of officers often work within the same offices.

In order to understand the Canadian parole system in greater depth, Canada's penological history and current correctional landscape needs to be reviewed. The first prison in Canada, Kingston Penitentiary, opened in 1835 and operated under the Auburn System (McCoy, 2012). The Auburn System is an outdated penological theory that tried to teach discipline, respect for property and other people through labour, and provoke contemplation and penitence through inmates' absolute silence (ibid). Harsh labour conditions were used to build character and provide a deterrent from future offending (ibid). The harsh labour conditions have since been described as "forced penal servitude", which aligned with the Auburn notion that prisons should be "so irksome and so terrible that [a prisoner] may dread nothing so much as a repetition of the punishment" (McCoy, 2012, p.31).

While the living conditions improved within Canadian prisons with less demanding physical labour and the availability of more communal leisure activities, the notion of retribution and punishment still persisted in Canadian penology into the 20th century (Parole Board of Canada, 2015). Even amongst the leading advocates for systemic change in corrections were feelings that prisons and parole ought to be punitive (ibid). One instance of this was Brigadier Archibald's statement made in 1908 when arguing for the benefits of parole and prisons. Archibald stated that "a system which does not inflict punishment is a dangerous menace to both citizen and state" (Parole Board of Canada, 2015, paragraph 25), yet at the same time stated that sick criminals are not incurable if they want to be helped.

Over the course of the 20th century, the Canadian correctional system would undergo many changes in terms of both penology and the use of alternative sentences (Parole Board of Canada, 2015). With the aid of the volunteer groups like the Salvation Army and the John Howard Society, a cultural shift took place (ibid). The cultural shift, with the advocacy of volunteers, resulted in Canadian penology moving from retributive punishment to reformation and rehabilitation, with humanitarianism and well-being for all citizens at its center (ibid).

Unlike in Sweden, changes in the correctional system tend to not occur uniformly across Canada. Rather, each province and territory produces its own correctional

environment and was only previously unified in federal legislation. Like Sweden and many other countries, two of Canada's ten provinces, Alberta and British Columbia, enacted legislation to sterilize certain groups up until the 1970s (McCavitt, 2013). The motives for each country's use of sterilization differ however. As previously mentioned, Swedish sterilizations were performed under the guise of humanitarianism. In Canada however, sterilization was motivated purely by eugenic aims with the hope that sterilizing undesirable groups of people would purify the country's gene pool and was therefore morally permissible (ibid). Sterilization in British Columbia and Alberta also took on a different form than in Sweden, as Swedes targeted homosexuals and sexual offenders, while the two Canadian provinces exclusively targeted the mentally ill, only some of which were also criminals (ibid). The distinction is an important one, as the Swedish adoption of sterilization originated as a then-advertised humanitarian act of social welfare, while Canada's sterilization laws, perhaps while less morally permitted, were more forthcoming. The distinction carries the notion that Sweden's correctional goals have at least always attempted to pursue goals that they felt kept inmates' humanity at its center, while Canada's correctional goals have not been as linear, with outright punitive and retributive goals up until the last half of the 20th century.

Similar to Sweden, humanitarian groups and volunteers substantially impacted the development of corrections in Canada. The John Howard Society, the Salvation Army and later on, the Elizabeth Fry Society, would act as major advocates for the treatment of prisoners and parolees, with pushes towards better living conditions in prisons, shorter prison sentences and gradual release plans (Parole Board of Canada, 2015). During World War II, prison reform was suspended and the end of the war brought about significant reformation that caused a "perceptible lightening of the atmosphere in Canadian prisons" (Parole Board of Canada, 2015, paragraph 87), with softer rules and rehabilitative treatment. The Post-War penology reforms included leisure activities within prisons, support groups, a prison newspaper and access to psychologists, social workers and teachers, which not only alleviated the harmful aspects of idleness and solitude while in prison, but inspired hope and opportunities for prisoners among release (ibid).

Up until 1975, Canadian penology reform continued, which was largely influenced by American, British and Scandinavian penology. Around this time however, a shift occurred, marking Canada as an innovator in penology and rehabilitative practices. In 1974, Robert Martinson, an American criminologist, published an article suggesting that current rehabilitative efforts do not impact recidivism, concluding that *nothing works* when it comes to rehabilitating criminals (Cullen & Gendreau, 2001). With the nothing works ideology casting a pessimistic shadow on the field of corrections in the U.S., Canadian criminologists put more emphasis into research regarding criminogenic factors and the predictive ability of current risk assessment techniques to show *what works* (Parole Board of Canada, 2015). This contrasting perspective from the U.S. and the ambitions of Canadian researchers set Canada a part in both North America and Europe. British and Scandinavian countries quickly adopted aspects of new Canadian rehabilitative principles and programs (Cullen & Gendreau, 2001). In 1976, the Canadian government also abolished the death sentence, which

further distinguished Canada from the U.S. (Parole Board of Canada, 2015).

Over the course of the next few decades, Canadian penology would continue to operate with rehabilitative principles in mind as well as operating within a just deserts model. Canadian penology would continue to treat offenders, while sentencing decisions would be based on the severity of the offense and the risk of the offender (Parole Board of Canada, 2015). With these principles in mind, offenders charged within the Canadian criminal justice system would be treated firmly but fairly and managed with the intention of rehabilitation (ibid).

4.4 Canada's parole system

The Canadian parole system is similar to Sweden in many ways, although there are some notable distinctions. Unlike in Sweden, Canadian parole and probation officers are two distinct careers. Probation relates to offenders sentenced to less than two years in prison and is managed at the provincial level (Parole Board of Canada, 2015). Parole officers on the other hand deal with offenders that serve at least two-year sentences, with at least the last third of a sentence being served in the community (ibid). It should also be noted that while release upon completing two-thirds of a sentence is mandatory, the Parole Board of Canada (PBC) can decline this right if the "offender is likely, if released, to commit an offence causing the death of or serious harm to another person before the expiration of the offender's sentence" (Manson 1997, p.235). While these professions are distinct, they are very similar in their job duties and expected qualifications, with most community offices containing both parole and probation officers that share available community resources (Manson, 1997). Parole decisions are made by the PBC, which can grant, deny and revoke parole (Parole Board of Canada, 2015). Naturally, Correctional Service Canada (CSC) works closely with the PBC, however they are still separate entities.

The dawn of parole in Canada began on August 11th, 1899 with the passing of the *Ticket of Leave Act* (Parole Board of Canada, 2015). The act granted 'tickets of leave' to offenders, which allowed inmates to be released into the community and under certain restrictions. The Prime Minister at the time, Sir Wilfred Laurier, defined the ticket of leave for:

"a young person of good character, who may have committed a crime in a moment of passion, or perhaps, have fallen victim to bad example, or the influence of unworthy friends. There is a good report on him[/her] while in confinement and it is supposed that if he[/she] were given another chance, he[/she] would be a good citizen" (Parole Board of Canada, 2015, paragraph 6).

Offenders with tickets of leave would be required to check in with a supervisor, which often consisted of police officers (ibid). The Salvation Army played a particularly prominent role in the parole history of Canada with some of their volunteers working as 'dominion parole officers', which would be the first official position of its kind in Canada (ibid).

The *Ticket of Leave Act* remained in place until 1959 when the *Parole Act* was passed, which emphasized the use of rehabilitation in the prisoner reentry process (Parole Board of Canada, 2015). The *Parole Act* also established the PBC as an independent authority (ibid). Similarly to the Swedish philosophy that corrections should not be swayed by political and cultural trends, PBC members were originally elected for 10-year terms. Within the first ten years of this election however, the *Parole Act* was revised in order to include mandatory supervision (ibid). Mandatory supervision required that inmates who had collected more than 60 days of remission, or time off of their sentence due to good behaviour, would have to be released to serve the remainder of the sentence in the community under the same conditions as a regular parolee (ibid). The legislative change and establishment of the PBC provided immense change in the Canadian correctional system, with the chance of an inmate being granted parole increasing from 20 percent in 1960 to 65 percent in 1972 (ibid).

Parole has since been met with some continued hostility, with the Canadian Sentencing Commission even advising that parole be abolished as it was deemed counterintuitive to the goals of prison sentences (Parole Board of Canada, 2015). This recommendation largely came in the wake of several offences committed by offenders on mandatory supervision and parole (ibid). In 1992 the *Corrections and Conditional Release Act* was passed, which introduced new diction into corrections, most notably, *risk-assessment* and *risk-management* (Public Safety Canada, 2010). The aspect of risk currently plays a large role in parole decisions, particularly in regards to violent and sexual offenders. The *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, being passed in 1982, in conjunction with the *Corrections and Conditional Release Act* have also expanded the rights of parolees and has sought to establish parolees as agents of change in their own rehabilitation and reintegration (ibid). This aspect of parolees being involved in the process, the extension of their rights, and the notion of parole being conditional on one's risk has thus shaped the present Canadian parole system to promote change and rehabilitation, while being transparent with clients through firm and fair treatment.

5. RISK ASSESSMENT

An integral aspect of both Swedish and Canadian parole is the concept of *risk assessment*. Risk assessments are used to classify clients based on their likelihood of recidivism and the seriousness in which recidivism may manifest. Risk assessments can be done at the beginning of the parole process while the client is still incarcerated in order to formulate an effective release plan (Jones et al., 2010). Reassessments can also be done at any point in time if conditions are breached (ibid). If a client's risk is deemed too high, then they may have to serve the remainder of their sentence in prison (ibid). Risk assessment is not limited to the parole field, but extends to many social service and health fields, from assessing hypomanic symptoms among psychiatric patients to predicting bone fractures among postmenopausal women (Black et al., 2001; Angst et al., 2005).

5.1 Canadian leadership in Risk-Need-Responsivity

Over the past 25 years, risk assessment has been studied more intensely and was inspired mostly due to Canada's 'what works' initiative. In turn, the Swedish Prison and Probation Service (SPPS) was quick to adopt Correctional Service Canada's (CSC) principles related to risk, most notably in their use of Risk-Need-Responsivity (RNR). Proposed by Andrews et al. (1990), RNR is the foundation of risk assessment and has inspired research and innovation around the world.

Risk, according to the RNR principles, has two aspects: *prediction* and *matching* (Andrews et al., 1990). *Prediction* refers to the classification of criminogenic risk factors, which includes personal and situational circumstances (ibid). *Matching* is the notion that the intensity of treatment is dependent upon the risk of a client (ibid). Andrews et al. (1990) suggest that high-risk offenders should be matched with intensive treatment, while low-risk offenders benefit the most from minimal intervention. Andrews et al. (2011) also argue that low-risk offenders should be diverted from the potentially harmful aspects of justice processing, including counterintuitive non-RNR programs and contact with high-risk offenders. Extant literature has proven several times over that calculating risk can accurately predict recidivism (Andrews & Bonta, 2007; Campbell et al., 2007).

The second aspect of RNR is *need*. Need refers to identifying the criminogenic risk factors that provoke delinquency (Andrews et al., 1990). From a parole perspective, these could also be factors that may not necessarily be criminal, but could cause a client to breach their conditions, such as consuming alcohol. Unlike risk, which can only decrease, remain the same, or increase, criminogenic needs are dynamic and can come and go (Bonta & Andrews, 2007). Certain needs may be also more common among certain kinds of clients (ibid). Seven criminogenic dynamic needs that Andrews et al. (1990) identified are: antisocial personality pattern, procriminal attitudes, social supports for crime, family relationships, school/work, and prosocial recreational activities. By identifying the criminogenic needs of clients, suitable treatment can be administered (ibid).

Classifying clients based on risk and criminogenic needs is not enough to ensure effective treatment. Rather, *responsivity* to treatment and services must be considered. The Camp Elliott Study best exemplifies how responsivity can vary between groups of people. The study found that low-maturity inmates responded better to the low-skilled supervisors' authoritarian and militaristic approach, while high-maturity inmates responded better to high-skilled supervisors' therapeutic approach (Grant, 1965 as cited by Walters, 1992). Thus, using the RNR model, parole officers should not only match clients with services and resources that address their criminogenic needs, but also with the types of services and resources that their personal attributes allow them to benefit from most (Bonta & Andrews, 2007). For instance, a client with low verbal skills and experiences anxiety when speaking in front of people would not be as responsive to group therapy sessions. By selecting methods of rehabilitation that clients will be responsive to and will be able to engage in to the fullest extent, parole officers give their clients the best chance of desisting from a criminal lifestyle.

5.2 Risk assessment tools

Canadian researchers have developed several risk assessment tools based on RNR principles that are suited for certain types of clients. For instance, the Canadian instrument, Static-99, is a 10-item scale that measures demographic details and criminal history and is the most widely used sexual offender risk assessment tool in the world (United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, 2012).

Another Canadian RNR-inspired assessment tool is the Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory, or YLS/CMI, and is the most widely used youth risk assessment tool in North America (Vitopoulos et al., 2012). YLS/CMI has been found to be the most effective in predicting recidivism, regardless of offense type, gender or aboriginal status (ibid). It should be noted that YLS/CMI is used in youth probation, yet it reflects the ways in which RNR principles have benefited both parole and probation workers with various types of clients.

A third widely used assessment tool is the Level of Service Inventory-Revised, or LSI-R. The LSI-R is a 53-item scale, or in the case of the province of Ontario's revised version, LSI-OR with 43 items, is used all across Canada. In the case of Ontario, the LSI-OR "is a required assessment for all adult inmates undergoing any institutional classification or release decision, for all young offenders both in secure and open custody and for all probationers and parolees [and is] ... readministered every six months and for any client-related decision" (Correctional Service Canada, 2013, paragraph 7). It is evident that risk assessment in Canada, particularly in Ontario, is expected and even mandatory when considering clients for parole and for their release plan.

Prediction tools are still developing and incorporating new technologies to include more accurate probabilistic calculations of risk to account for dynamic changes that occur throughout supervision or during treatment, (Campbell et al., 2007). The amount of attention given by both Swedish and Canadian researchers to predictive technologies and techniques suggests that predicting risk will remain at the forefront of their parole systems for the foreseeable future.

5.3 Swedish pre-sentence reports and resistance to risk

While the Swedish parole system has adopted RNR principles, the use of various risk assessment tools has been met with resistance by Swedish parole officers, particularly in regards to pre-sentence reports (PSRs) (Persson & Svensson, 2012). PSRs pertain to determining probation conditions, which in this case is only relevant to Swedish parole officers, as they have both parole and probation clients (ibid). PSRs help judges or parole board members in determining an appropriate type and length of sentence (ibid). Persson and Svensson (2012) found that most judges would prefer that PSRs by parole officers be more-risk oriented.

Persson and Svensson's (2012) study on the use of risk assessment in PSRs found that only 4.4% of Swedish parole officers in their studies actually used standardized risk assessment tools. Parole officers in the study were far more likely to focus on offenders' needs and social situations than risk (Persson and Svensson, 2012). Unlike

in Canada, where the LSI-R is used, there is no one standardized assessment tool used by correctional workers in Sweden. While SPPS is moving towards a more managerial system and encouraging the use of such standardized tools, research suggests that Swedish parole officers would rather use alternative ways to assess a client's risk (ibid:176).

A year prior to the study mentioned above, Persson and Svensson (2011) measured parole attitudes towards risk assessment in PSRs. Some officers in the study questioned their ability to assess risk and felt that they required more training and support to do so effectively (Persson & Svensson, 2011). This hesitation to adopt standardized practices is reflective of Swedish parole officers' resistance to adopt managerial principles set out by the SPPS, and this creates a further divide between the organization and its officers. A common theme in the study also suggested that Swedish parole officers try to help their clients within the constraining environment of the SPPS, with one respondent saying "I think the SPPS often violate their clients. I place high value on not doing it" (Persson & Svensson, 2011, p.102). Organizational divide in general has been the subject of some research, which suggests that the higher a person is within an organization, the more they identify with the organization's ideas (Lipsky, 2010 as cited by Persson & Svensson, 2012). It may be the case that parole office managers are more likely to highly value risk assessments encourage their employees to use a risk-based managerial parole style than their employees would like (ibid). Persson and Svensson (2011) maintain that while the divide in an organization is to be expected, the specific resistance to risk assessment stems from parole officers' attitudes towards providing care more than control in their positions. It should be noted though that two-thirds of the officers in Persson and Svensson's (2011) study either accepted risk or were neutral towards it, yet the third of officers that resisted risk-based practices are vital to understanding the non-uniform shift towards risk throughout the SPPS. In non-PSR related research, results have varied. There have been several studies in Sweden that have tested North American risk assessment tools like the LSI-R and Static-99, but there have been mixed results. Sjöstedt and Långström (2001) found that Static-99 predicted violent recidivism with high accuracy. A later study by Långström (2004) found that the accuracy of actuarial risk assessments may vary across demographic groups, particularly when considering ethnicity and migration status. In a more recent study, Belfrage and Strand (2012) found that actuarial risk assessments conducted by law enforcement officers in Stockholm had poor and perhaps even negative predictive powers of risk assessments. The study found that offenders in all but the high-risk group reported high recidivism (Belfrage & Strand, 2012). The authors concluded that low recidivism in the high-risk group might be because they received the majority of police resources to prevent reoffending, while the lower risk groups were ignored, allowing more reoffending to occur (ibid). These kinds of mixed findings in both parole and police research may have caused parole officers' resistance to actuarial risk assessments, which could explain why some Swedish parole officers prefer narrative assessments.

5.4 Canadian pre-sentence reports and acceptance of risk

While PSRs pertain only to probation officers in Canada, a few points are worth

noting. First, the inclusion of risk in PSRs has been met with less resistance by Canadian probation officers than their Swedish counterparts. However, Canadian probation officers have resisted the format within which they write PSRs. Canadian probation officers have the option to either explain an offender's risk in a narrative form, such as 'the offender has an extensive history of sexual crimes and drug use' or can calculate actuarial risk, such as 'the offender has a 70% chance of reoffending within six months' (Bonta et al., 2005). Bonta et al.'s (2005) study found that Canadian probation officers prefer to write narratives and unlike in Sweden, Canadian judges also prefer narrative PSRs over actuarial PSRs (ibid). This preference for narrative PSRs is somewhat unfortunate however, since current research argues that calculated actuarial assessments seem to be more accurate in predicting recidivism than narrative reports (ibid). The less accurate narrative format that some Canadian probation officers use in PSRs could therefore result in inappropriate sentencing that does not predict risk as accurately, nor effectively target needs in ways that clients will be responsive to. It follows that poor assessments could lower the chance of successful client rehabilitation if they do not receive effective treatment, which in turn could endanger those within the client's community (Bonta & Andrews, 2007).

While Canadian probation officers appear similar to Swedish officers in regards to providing narrative risk assessments in PSRs, parole officers demonstrate more actuarial approach to their risk assessment practices. While Persson and Svensson (2011) suggest that some Swedish officers feel ill-equipped as well as disinterested in making risk a pivotal part of their role, research on Canadian officers suggests that they are not only more accepting of assessing risk, but are competent in doing so (Jones et al., 2010). For instance, one Canadian study found that parole officers are just as capable of providing strong predictive risk assessments as researchers using exhaustive and extensive assessment tools (ibid). It should be noted that risk assessment may be a gendered practice and some studies have sought to focus on populations other than white males (Hannah-Moffat, 2004). One Canadian study on violent female offenders, for example, argued that PBC decisions are dependent on a client's demonstrated ability to change in prison and their ability to manage their own risk in the community (Hannah-Moffat & Yule, 2011). In the absence of actuarial risk assessments though, PBC members used their own clinical skills and views of 'normative femininity' to determine a client's risk (ibid).

The general acceptance of risk assessment among Canadian parole officers could be for a few reasons. One reason to explain Canadian parole officer's lack of resistance to risk assessment could be that standardized assessment tools are used in prison and social work settings. For example, all Canadian federal institutions are equipped with Intake Assessment Units, where new inmates undergo sessions to determine criminal risk and to analyze their specific needs (Motiuk, 1994). In social work positions, risk assessment is also common practice, particularly for assessing a child's safety in the care of a parent or guardian (Ministry of Child and Youth Services Ontario, 2000). The acceptance of risk assessment may not only stem from having experience with risk assessment, but also from an understanding that risk assessment is a uniform expectation across all levels of CSC and social work positions. Since RNR research

originated in Canada, there may also be a cultural bias for Canadian officers to adopt domestic strategies rather than foreign ones, which could also explain Swedish officers' resistance to the foreign notion of risk assessment.

Overall, research suggests that risk assessment is more central to parole in Canada than in Sweden. While the use of risk is supposed to be dependent on its consideration of the needs and responsivity of clients, the studies mentioned above suggest an unequal balance. In order for the Canadian parole system to uphold a balanced system, current control-oriented practices need to keep needs and responsivity in mind. Having reviewed the literature, it is also apparent that both CSC and SPPS explicitly emphasize the importance of all three aspects of RNR, which brings up the need to explore why Canadian officers are quicker to favour risk and Swedish officers are quicker to favour needs. While Swedish and Canadian parole officers have balanced attitudes, the former are slightly more control-oriented and the latter are slightly more care-oriented in regards to risk assessments.

6. ELECTRONIC MONITORING

Electronic monitoring, or EM, refers to using wearable devices to track offenders, usually in the form of an ankle bracelet. EM devices track the location of an offender to enforce geographical conditions of sentences. Geographic conditions can either be restrictive inclusive zones, such as restricting an offender to his home at night, or exclusive zones, such as detecting whether or not a sexual offender has entered into a school zone. There are two specific instances in which EM conditions are placed upon an offender. The first is known as *front door EM*, which is an alternative sentence to imprisonment. In 1994, Sweden was the first country to adopt a national front door EM scheme (Marklund & Holmberg, 2009; Nellis & Bungerfeldt, 2013). The second application of EM is *back door EM*, which is used in the release of a prisoner at the end of a prison term in a parole context (ibid). In both instances, EM provides constant supervision and some believe that it reduces the workload of parole officers, while serving purely control interests (Yeh, 2010). EM can place clients at the scene of a crime, or be used to find clients that have breached the conditions of parole (ibid). EM has evoked various reactions, as it is a more control-oriented form of supervision within which an offender's physical location is tracked more closely than in regular forms of parole (Marklund & Holmberg, 2009; Nellis & Bungerfeldt, 2013).

While EM is useful, there are limitations of these devices, such as weak signals under concrete or steel buildings (ibid). This touches upon the notion that "the total dependence on the EM system is without a doubt the weakest" (Carlsson, 2003 as cited by Nellis & Bungerfeldt, 2013, p.284) aspect of using EM in parole. It is important to then ensure that the abilities of EM technology are dictated by the needs of parole officers, rather than altering parole practices to fit with the technology (ibid). That being said, EM has been positively regarded as a cost-efficient and effective way to aid parole officers in their role around the world. A study by Yeh

(2010) in the U.S. found that combining EM with home detention is one of the most financially stable ways to supervise offenders in the community, as society would gain 12.70 U.S. dollars for every dollar spent on EM and home detention. While the study concluded that home detention and EM be used instead of parole, rather than in conjunction with it, it is worth noting nevertheless that even conservative countries with high incarceration rates see the value in EM, if not for humanitarian purposes then at least for economic ones (Yeh, 2010).

6.1 Swedish leadership in electronic monitoring

While Canada may have more experience of and innovation in risk assessment, the same can be said for Sweden's use of EM. The SPPS has incorporated EM in a few ways, such as in parole, probation and in open prisons. EM has been found to lighten workloads of Swedish correctional workers, reduce costs and provide new sentencing alternatives (Marklund & Holmberg, 2009). CSC on the other hand has been slow to adopt EM and has only recently tested a pilot program in a correctional environment.

As mentioned earlier, until the fall of the conservative government in 1994, control practices and a just deserts model dominated the Swedish correctional field, which meant that seemingly 'soft' sentences, such as EM in home detention, were not deemed desirable or able to be used in proportion to the seriousness of any crime (Nellis & Bungerfeldt, 2013). With the election of the social democratic party in 1994 and the success of EM in a Dutch prison, EM became a sentencing option for community supervision (ibid). The Dutch prison study found that EM guards' security work, such as finding and counting prisoners, was reduced by 70% (ibid). This quickly led to the SPPS adopting EM across services, including prisons, probation and parole (ibid).

EM was first introduced to the SPPS in a pilot project in 1994, which tested intensive supervision with electronic monitoring (Nellis & Bungerfeldt, 2013). EM was met with some apprehension, with the SPPS calling EM devices *fotboja*, which translates to *tagging shackle*, rather than something more humanizing, like *tether*, *bracelet*, or merely *tag*. This sort of language and the technology itself suggests more control-oriented practices, as it is primarily a way to supervise offenders. Arguments against the use of EM as an aspect of conditional release were quickly abandoned after the great success of the pilot project, which resulted in a national EM program in 1996 (Jarred, 2000). Participants in the 1994 pilot project had a 90% rate of completing their sentence of intensive supervision with EM in the community (ibid). Of the 10% of breached sentences, almost all were due to drug and alcohol violations (ibid). The amount of low-risk offenders in Swedish prisons also dropped by 10% within the project's first six years, which some attribute to the use of EM and community sentences (ibid). Recidivism rates were also found to be slightly lower than those serving more of their sentences in prisons (ibid). For these reasons, it was agreed at an early stage that EM was a beneficial way to keep communities safe, while also removing offenders from the harms associated with criminogenic aspects of prisons.

By 2001, both back door and front door EM schemes were established in Sweden (Marklund & Holmberg, 2009). Sweden's National Council for Crime Prevention

conducted a pilot project between 1999 and 2001 to see whether there were positive effects of back door EM. Research up until 1999 had found no negative effects, yet whether there were positive effects remained speculative (ibid). The 1999-2001 pilot project combined EM with home detention and treatment, which was a novel idea at the time. For instance, Yeh's (2010) U.S. study took place nearly a decade later and made the conclusion that EM, home detention and treatment should be used in conjunction. The early integration of EM in other kinds of sentences demonstrates Swedish innovation and leadership in electronically monitoring parolees.

The 1999-2001 Swedish pilot project measured the impacts of an EM release program, which required parolees to partake in four hours of work or study, an hour of free leisure time, and a few hours of either treatment-related activities or other activities to improve their social situation (Marklund & Holmberg, 2009). The inclusion of treatment, improving social circumstances and helping to find work opportunities is crucial to understanding the Swedish use of EM, as it is not as strictly control-oriented as it might first appear. As one EM client stated, "It's a big shock to be released directly from prison. Now I take it in steps" (Marklund & Holmberg, 2009, p.47), which demonstrates how EM can be thought of as a transitional tool between imprisonment, full parole and eventually, freedom. The study found that low-risk clients above the age of 37 benefited the most from the program, while the high-risk clients reported higher recidivism rates (ibid). Recidivism was 10% less likely among these older, low-risk clients, which suggests that older clients are more receptive to this kind of release (Marklund & Holmberg, 2009). Based on these findings, EM and risk assessment should coexist and be combined to provide clients with the most effective release plan possible and the best chance of desisting. The results also suggest that demographic characteristics, such as age, be considered when creating post-release plans.

With the encouraging results from the 1999-2001 pilot project, Sweden's National Council for Crime Prevention conducted a new project in 2005. The project focused on the relationship between supervision and support by measuring clients' satisfaction and victims' opinions of knowing that their perpetrator was being electronically monitored (Wennerberg & Holmberg, 2007). Considering the victim is not an unusual practice for Swedish EM research, as the SPPS pioneered the notion of notifying victims when their perpetrators were conditionally released via intensive supervision with EM (Pinto & Nellis, 2012). The study found that the majority of victims did not feel more endangered or worried whether their victimizer was being electronically monitored in the community or remained imprisoned (ibid). Having victims as one of the study's focuses demonstrates the commitment to not sacrificing community safety for EM opportunities. The inclusion of victims also demonstrates how the SPPS provides humane and effective support for clients, while also considering victims' reactions to knowing that their perpetrator is in the community. The victim-focused pilot exemplifies how far ahead Swedish EM research is, compared to the majority of other countries that are still in the process of exclusively studying EM from officer and offender perspectives.

EM continues to be a popular tool for Swedish parole officers. Clients are still

required to attend meetings with their parole officer, but less frequently, at about two to three times a month, rather than once a week (Wennerberg & Holmberg, 2007). Parole officers can also make unexpected home visits and test for drugs and alcohol (ibid). Both parole officers and clients have positively evaluated EM (ibid). Clients often advocate for the use of EM as it allows them to spend time with friends and family, while being able to work or study (ibid). Like regular parole, EM release is a crucial period, in which clients have access to rehabilitation programs, counseling and crime prevention programs (ibid). These resources may slip away once the EM period is passed, so it is crucial that parole officers do not simply tag clients and grant them total independence (Marklund & Holmberg, 2009). The Swedish parole system should maintain a balanced approach to EM and specifically in a way that values EM technology's ability to help clients complete treatment programs.

6.2 Canadian caution towards electronic monitoring

While Sweden has been a leader in EM parole practices, CSC has been cautious in its adoption. Despite the generally positive results of Swedish and other European pilot projects, there have been ethical and practical concerns regarding EM parole and probation. Despite these concerns, there are currently seven provinces and one territory with EM probation programs, as most practitioners agree that it is a good alternative to imprisonment (Bonta et al., 1999). Research suggests that EM may be more problematic than beneficial in parole and that its current use in probation should be reevaluated. Since the application of EM and its challenges are virtually identical between probation and parole, both areas of research will be considered.

One major concern for both probation and parole officers' inclusion of EM in their monitoring of clients relates to the concept of *net widening*. In the context of using EM in probation and parole, net widening refers to over-supervising clients to the point that officers report more breaches (Public Safety Committee, 2012). In a session with the Parliament's Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security, the director of public safety research, Bonta, said that probation and parole officers are "doing more intervention unnecessarily, catching people in the corrections net who perhaps don't require it" (Public Safety Committee, 2012, p.6). Bonta continued by stating that EM is only valuable when applied to moderate and high-risk offenders in conjunction with effective treatment plans (ibid).

Along with the notion of net widening, there have been arguments from both sides pertaining to the impacts of EM on parole officers' workloads. While the Dutch Prison study, for example, demonstrated how EM can reduce workloads, other researchers suggest that EM adds to the workload of officers by forcing them to respond to the breach alerts that result from technological issues than from true instances of a breach (Bottos, 2007; Nellis and Bungerfeldt, 2013). Recent research sides with the latter argument, with a pilot project from 2008-2009 finding that 81% of CSC parole officers reported up to a 25% increase in their workload with the inclusion of EM-related tasks (ibid). 39% of officers also felt that their current work structure made it impractical to incorporate EM supervision (ibid). The study recommended that workload formulas be restructured if EM is to be included in regular parole practice (ibid).

The 2008-2009 pilot study also tested the limitations of current EM technology in order to test things like battery issues, false tamper alerts and global positioning satellite (GPS) drift (Correctional Service Canada, 2009). The study found that charging the monitoring device could be difficult and that the device requires manufacturing enhancements in order to be seriously considered for consistent tracking information (ibid). There were also many cases of false tamper alerts, with clients often setting off the alarm with an accidental hit while working, hardware issues or installation issues (ibid). Most notably, the GPS systems malfunctioned on occasion, which skewed clients' actual location, sometimes up to 200 feet (ibid). Monitoring a client's physical location is the primary function of the ankle bracelet and in many cases is the difference between returning to prison for appearing to have breached a geographical restriction (ibid). The pilot study overall ended with mixed feelings, especially with the project costing approximately 0.8 million Canadian dollars, or 5.1 million Swedish kronor; a costly endeavour which provoked questions as to whether efforts spent on studying EM were a waste of time and money (Public Safety Committee, 2012).

CSC took the results of the 2008-2009 pilot project to inform a current pilot project that is underway across Canada. It should be noted that the current pilot project is exclusively for parole purposes, hence its national application across Canada. The pilot project's main goals are to measure whether offending behaviour is impacted by EM and to test the use of the new GPS and radio frequency hybrid ankle bracelets (Correctional Service Canada, 2015). The project plan also explicitly refers to risk and risk assessment in regards to reassessing offenders should they breach geographical or other types of conditions (ibid). The report refers to only using EM on moderate and high-risk offenders, since past research has demonstrated that low-risk offenders do not benefit from additional supervision of intensive EM (Renzema & Mayo-Wilson, 2005; Public Safety Committee, 2012; Correctional Service Canada, 2015). It is evident that the Canadian parole system still perceives risk as a central pillar and is incorporating EM around the notion of risk. In order to rectify issues with GPS drift in older models, the new EM devices use radio frequency, which simply detects the absence or presence when offender is at home and relies on GPS for tracking out-of-home movement (Correctional Service Canada, 2015). In theory, the radio frequency will help with parole conditions such as curfews, while GPS will be used to ensure that clients do not enter exclusion zones (ibid). The pilot project began in 2015 and will continue into 2018, after which recommendations as to whether EM should be used in parole will be made.

In the same meeting with the Canadian Parliament's Standing Committee on Public Safety previously mentioned, Nellis, a leading EM British researcher, explicitly stated that he felt the Swedish use of EM was the most effective (Public Safety Committee, 2012). The following quotation exemplifies the way in which the Canadian government, and more specifically, Correctional Service Canada, would like to imitate the Swedish EM model:

"As well as being employed during the day and subject to an electronically monitored curfew at night, you will also be doing the kind of program that probation services the world over provide to address drug, alcohol, and anger problems, and to address employment and training opportunities. Those would be the integrated measures. It's actually quite a simple system in Sweden. There isn't a complicated range of activities. The crucial thing is that in Sweden, they basically keep you busy all week, so you don't have a lot of free time. You can be hanging around doing all sorts of things because you're only subject to a curfew at night. The Swedes don't allow that in their system; if you're on electronic monitoring, you stay at home at night, but you are also busy during the day with other aspects of the penalty" (Public Safety Committee, 2012, p.5).

This sort of discourse explicitly states the admiration of Swedish EM ideologies that some Canadian and British researchers and policy makers hold.

The Canadian resistance to EM can be explained through two related factors. First, Canadian research has not produced any results suggesting that using EM in parole reduces recidivism or protects communities better than non-monitored forms of parole. The lack of results may be due to methodological biases, or it may be the case that EM does not work in risk-oriented systems. This corresponds with the second possible explanation for resisting EM in Canada. The Swedish use of EM is arguably more focused on rehabilitation and social welfare, with officers preferring to outline social circumstances and needs rather than risk, while Canada's underlying EM principles stem from the management of risk and public safety. Swedish EM applications are used to ensure that rehabilitative programs are being completed and to provide a transition period for successful reintegration into the community. Canada's past and present EM pilot projects on the other hand focus more on how particular types of clients, based on a combination of offense category and risk type, react to being electronically monitored and whether it reduces their chance of recidivism. In this sense, it is evident that while the Canadian system looks to Sweden for guidance in EM parole practices, each country has distinct interests and long-term plans. It may be the case that despite the belief in RNR principles, Canadian parole officers focus more on *risk* than on the *needs* and *responsivity* of clients when considering EM. If this is the case and Canadian researchers aim to get positive results from using EM like Sweden, then a balanced application of RNR principles is necessary, as well as a philosophical shift to viewing EM as a transition tool to reach rehabilitative and reintegrative objectives.

7. RESULTS

A review of Swedish and Canadian research suggests despite having nearly identical structural and organizational parole systems, officers in each country perform in unique and distinct ways. Swedish and Canadian parole research and practices have been shaped by one another. Sweden integrated the Canadian RNR model to perform

evidence-based risk assessments through mostly narrative forms. For reasons that are still unclear, Swedish parole officers prefer to assess risk not in calculable ways, but in ways that allow clients' individual characteristics and social histories to be contextualized. In this regard, perhaps the SPPS aims to mimic the Canadian risk-centered parole approach; but Swedish parole officers do not. It is evident that despite some uncertainty in the literature, the Swedish parole system and its officers operate with a balanced approach to caring for and controlling clients. In contrast, Canadian parole officers are quicker to adopt RNR principles and have allowed risk to be a central feature of their job. While the notion of risk sounds control-oriented and repressive, the Canadian model demonstrates a moderately balanced application of care and control, although it perhaps leans more towards control when RNR principles are concerned. The research suggests that there is some room for improvement in regards to determining specific needs and types of programming that clients will be responsive to.

Research suggests that Sweden is far ahead of Canada in its adaptation of electronic monitoring in parole. The Swedish use of EM acts as a sustainable and effective condition particularly when combined with social programming and treatment. The Swedish Prison and Probation Service have incorporated a seemingly controlling practice within their rehabilitative system, which demonstrates a commitment to balancing care and control principles. Correctional Service Canada is currently undergoing a national pilot project to determine once and for all whether EM is a viable option for parole in Canada. As of yet it is unclear as to whether the pilot project has been successful, but if it is, then EM will certainly be meshed with aspects of RNR principles to meet both care and control aspirations, as has been done in Sweden.

7.1 Limitations

There are several limitations of the thesis that must be acknowledged to provide some self-critique and to make future researchers aware of the limitations to consider when pursuing similar research. Most notably, only English literature and statistics were considered. This proved to be a major limitation of the thesis as the Swedish Prison and Probation Service and the Ministry of Justice almost exclusively write reports in Swedish. While there was a large portion of academic literature written in English, there were still several studies in Sweden that could not be considered and could have impacted conclusions.

A further limitation of the thesis is that a consideration of motivational interviewing was not possible due to a lack of empirical literature in both Swedish and Canadian parole settings. Motivational interviewing refers to an interaction style that provokes self-motivation and accountability (Walters et al., 2010). While the concept of motivational interviewing has been around for over 20 years, it has only recently been applied in the context of corrections (*ibid*). If more research had been done on motivational interviewing techniques among Swedish and Canadian parole officers, it would have been a valuable addition to the thesis. It is hoped that parole researchers will see the value in motivational interviewing for building stronger officer-client relationships through evidence-based counseling techniques in the future.

A third limitation of the study is the national origins of the literature reviewed. It was necessary in a literature review of Swedish and Canadian parole systems to use Swedish and Canadian studies, yet there could be cultural or political bias in the data collection process and perhaps even the publication process that is limiting. Depending on where funding originated from, either from educational institutions or governmental organizations, the research reviewed may have originally been written with political agendas in mind.

In terms of a more macroscopic limitation, aspects of gender, ethnicity, religion and other demographic characteristics were not discussed much in the thesis. For instance, perceptions of Canadian First-Nations parole officers vary from their colleagues, or perhaps access to community-based supervision resources differ in Indian reservations than in other parts of Canada. Research shows that First-Nation groups prefer the use of restorative justice principles in the community through resolution circles, which can include talking-sticks, prayers and smudging ceremonies (Lin, 2001). Restorative justice is growing in popularity in Canada and could be useful in the reintegration of parolees in regards to destigmatizing and building positive victim-offender relationships (ibid). Likewise, incarcerated travelling Romani offenders in Sweden may make EM mixed with home detention difficult if not impossible, but no research currently exists on the topic.

A final limitation of the thesis is that literature was selected on the basis of thematic review and was then metasythesized. It should be noted that selection based on themes and recent findings were also subject to the author's interpretation of their relevance to the research aims. While objectivity was placed as an adamant principle in the collection and review phase, some underlying bias may exist.

8. FUTURE IMPLICATIONS

The thesis has reviewed current research and has recognized gaps in literature and possibilities for future research. First, there is a distinct lack of cross-cultural comparative research between Swedish and Canadian officers' attitudes and role orientations. Pursuing attitudinal and orientation research would be an immensely beneficial study for parole officers and managers, as it could compare burnout rates, stress levels and depressive symptoms. By calculating and comparing these rates with things like training, types of education, resources and caseloads, the best practices for maintaining healthy and effective parole officers could be selected for. There are also no studies that compare officers by location in Canada or Sweden. Although both countries have national parole organizations, some more heavily populated areas may have access to more resources or training opportunities, which may influence officers' performance and mental health.

The rise of risk in the Swedish and Canadian parole systems will likely impact parole in the foreseeable future and there are many implications for researchers,

practitioners, policy makers and communities with parolees. From a Canadian perspective, it is imperative to not reduce a client to purely an actuarial risk number, but to give the needs of the client and their responsivity to particular kinds of intervention equal consideration. The current acceptance of risk-based practices must be tempered so as not to over-assess and ignore rehabilitative and reintegrative factors. From an opposite Swedish perspective, the adoption of standardized risk assessment tools at least for certain types of clients, such as sexual or violent clients, in conjunction with the current narratives seen in pre-sentence reports is advised. From Canadians incorporating more social needs and programming and Swedes using more evidence-based risk techniques, both systems could maintain balanced practices that serve both care and control purposes. In summation, it is essential to the ethos of Swedish and Canadian parole and corrections that all RNR principles be applied equally in the future.

The early adoption of EM in a country with similar parole strategies like Sweden is invaluable to Canada, as mistakes can be avoided and advisements could be made. The use of diary entries in relation to how Swedish parole officers budget their time in regards to EM, such as how often they meet with clients and how much time they allocate to EM alerts could be beneficial to Canadian officers that will likely use EM technology in the near future. If Canada is to mimic any part of modern Swedish EM philosophies, it should be to apply EM in conjunction with structured programming in order to make the parole process a key transition period from incarceration to freedom and to not use it to simply expand the surveillance abilities of parole officers. Additionally, the current pilot project in Canada may be a useful demonstration to Sweden of how to blend more intensive risk-based practices with EM.

If policy makers positively evaluate the current EM pilot project in Canada, there are several implications. First, the success of EM in a national parole project may encourage provinces and territories to add EM to their probation sanctions or alter how they already use EM technology. If more EM is used nationally via parole and provincially via probation, the money saved from having to house offenders in prisons could be allocated to provide resources and programming for parolees. As seen in the past, changes in the probation system are not uniform, but occur at different rates across provinces and territories. Second, a successful EM pilot project that influences policies may lower federal incarceration rates across Canada. For instance, incarcerated offenders that would otherwise have been denied parole may be granted parole with the added feature of EM. As EM has been proven to only truly benefit medium and high-risk offenders, this may lead to more potentially dangerous offenders serving more of their sentences in the community. The emphasis of risk assessments and providing effective treatment on a case-by-case basis should ultimately be of the utmost importance to ensuring community safety.

9. CONCLUSION

This thesis has achieved the original research aims. A review of relevant research revealed that both Sweden and Canada have incorporated risk and EM in similar yet distinct ways. Sweden has positioned itself as a leader in EM-based parole practices, while Canada has set the same tone in regards to risk assessment. The second research aim was also met, as it was found that Sweden and Canada have both used risk assessment and EM, two seemingly control-oriented practices, in a balanced way. Sweden has had more opportunities to demonstrate its use of EM and parole, while this is a new and less tested practice in Canada. Nonetheless, Sweden and Canada's individual balanced approaches demonstrate the flexibility of each parole system to accept new technologies and managerial philosophies while not compromising strong rehabilitative principles. The thesis not only met the original research aims, but also identified gaps in literature that future research could explore and, if applied in practice, could result in healthier, more effective officer-client relationships.

REFERENCES

- Aday RH, (1976). Institutional Dependency: a theory of aging in prison. Doctoral Dissertation, *Oklahoma State University*.
- Andrews D A, Bonta J & Hoge R D, (1990). Classification for effective rehabilitation: rediscovering psychology. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 17, 19-52.
- Andrews D A, Bonta J & Wormith J S, (2011). The risk-need-responsivity (RNR) model: Does adding the good lives model contribute to effective crime prevention? *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 38(7), 735-755.
- Angst J, Adolfsson R, Benazzi F, Gamma A, Hantouche E, Meyer T D, Skeppar P, Vieta E & Scott J, (2005). The HCL-32: towards a self-assessment tool for hypomanic symptoms in outpatients. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 88, 217-233.
- Bayer P, Pintoff R & Pozen D E, (2003). Building criminal capital behind bars: social learning in juvenile corrections. *Center Discussion Papers, Economic Growth Center, Yale University*. Paper 864.
- Belfrage H & Strand S, (2012). Measuring the outcome of structured spousal violence risk assessments using the B-SAFER: risk in relation to recidivism and intervention. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 30, 420-430.
- Black D M, Steinbuch M, Palermo L, Dargent-Molina P, Lindsay R, Hoseyni M S & Johnell O, (2001). An assessment tool for predicting fracture risk in postmenopausal women. *Osteoporosis International*, 12, 519-528.
- Bonta J & Andrews D A, (2007). Risk-need-responsivity model for offender assessment and rehabilitation. *Public Safety Canada*. Available from: <http://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/rsrscs/pblctns/rsk-nd-rspnsvty/rsk-nd-rspnsvty-eng.pdf> [November 20 2015].
- Bonta J, Bourgon G, Jesseman R & Yessine A K, (2005). Pre-sentence reports in Canada. *Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada*. Available from: <https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/rsrscs/pblctns/prsntnc-rprts-cnd/prsntnc-rprts-cnd-eng.pdf> [November 29 2015].
- Bonta J, Wallace-Capretta S & Rooney J, (1999). Electronic monitoring in Canada. *Public Works and Government Services Canada*. Available from: <https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/rsrscs/pblctns/lctrnc-mntrng-cnd/lctrnc-mntrng-cnd-eng.pdf> [March 10 2016].
- Bottos S, (2007). An overview of electronic monitoring in corrections: the issues and implications. *Correctional Service Canada*. Available from: <http://www.csc->

scc.gc.ca/research/r182-eng.shtml#Toc162672848 [March 10 2016].

Campbell, M A, French S & Gendreau P, (2007). Assessing the utility of risk assessment tools and personality measures in the prediction of violent recidivism for adult offenders. *Public Safety Canada*. Available from: <https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/rsrscs/pblctns/rsk-ssmnt-tls/rsk-ssmnt-tls-eng.pdf> [December 8 2015].

Canals J M, (1960). Classicism, positivism and social defense. *Journal of Law and Criminology*, 50(6), 541-550.

Carson E A, (2014). Prisoners in 2013. *U.S. Department of Justice: Bureau of Justice Statistics*. Available from: <http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/p13.pdf> [April 10 2016].

Cochran J C & Mears D P, (2013). Social isolation and inmate behavior: a conceptual framework for theorizing prison visitation and guiding and assessing research. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 41(4), 252-261.

Correctional Service Canada (2009). Evaluation report: electronic monitoring program pilot. Available from: <http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/text/pa/empp/index-eng.shtml> [March 25 2016].

Correctional Service Canada (2013). Research to practice: applying risk/needs assessment to offender supervision. Available from: <http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/research/forum/e091/e091f-eng.shtml> [May 1 2016].

Correctional Service Canada (2015). Electronic monitoring. Available from: <http://s3.documentcloud.org/documents/1681847/electric-monitors.pdf> [April 28 2016].

Cullen F T & Gendreau P, (2001). From nothing works to what works: changing professional ideology in the 21st century. *The Prison Journal*, 81(3), 313-338.

Erwin E J, Brotherson M J & Summers J A, (2011). Understanding qualitative metasynthesis. *Journal of Early Intervention*, 33(3), 186-200.

Fulton B, Stichman A, Travis L & Latessa E, (1997). Moderating probation and parole officer attitudes to achieve desired outcomes. *The Prison Journal*, 77(3), 295-312.

Gayman M D & Bradley M S, (2013). Organizational climate, work stress, and depressive symptoms among probation and parole officers. *Criminal Justice Studies*, 26(3), 326-346.

Hannah-Moffat K, (2004). Losing ground: gendered knowledges, parole risk, and

responsibility. *Social Politics*, 11(3), 365-385.

Hannah-Moffat K & Yule C, (2011). Gaining insight, changing attitudes and managing 'risk': parole release decisions for women convicted of violent crimes. *Punishment and Society*, 13(2), 149-175.

Healy D, (2012). Advise, assist and befriend: can probation supervision support desistance? *Social Policy and Administration*, 46(4), 377-394.

Holmberg S, Kindgren J & Bogestam N, (2012). Non-custodial care in Sweden: a summary of three evaluations. *National Council for Crime Prevention Sweden*.

Available from:

https://www.bra.se/download/18.1ff479c3135e8540b29800015182/1371914738144/2012_ENG+Summary_friv_rd_eng_1.pdf [December 16 2015].

Hornum F, (1988). Corrections in two social welfare democracies: Denmark and Sweden. *The Prison Journal*, 68, 63-82.

Institute for Criminal Policy and Research (2015). World prison brief: Sweden.

Available from: <http://www.prisonstudies.org/country/sweden> [November 15 2015].

James E, (2014). 'Prison is not for punishment in Sweden. We get people into better shape.' *The Guardian*. Available from:

<http://www.theguardian.com/society/2014/nov/26/prison-sweden-not-punishment-nils-oberg> [November 15 2015].

Jarred W, (2000). Electronic monitoring: corrective service bill 2000. *Queensland Parliamentary Library*. Available from:

<https://www.parliament.qld.gov.au/documents/explore/ResearchPublications/LegislationBriefs/lbr1100wj.pdf> [April 1 2016].

Jones M & Kerbs J J, (2007). Probation and parole officers and discretionary decision-making: responses to technical and criminal violations. *Federal Probation*, 71, 9-15.

Jones N J, Brown S L & Zamble E, (2010). Predicting criminal recidivism in adult male offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 37(8), 860-882.

Justice Policy Institute (2011). Finding direction: expanding criminal justice options by considering policies of other nations. Available from:

http://www.justicepolicy.org/uploads/justicepolicy/documents/parole_and_reentry.pdf [December 12 2015].

Långström N, (2004). Accuracy of actuarial procedures for assessment of sexual offender recidivism risk may vary across ethnicity. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 16(2), 107-120.

Lewis K R, Lewis L S & Garby T M, (2013). Surviving the trenches: the personal impact of the job on probation officers. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38, 67-84.

Lin B, (2001). Program helps young aboriginals get on right track.” *Raven’s Eye*, 4(12), 10.

Lindholm M & Bishop N, (2008). Sweden. Chapter 32 in Kalmthout A M & Dinescu I (eds) *Probation in Europe*. Nijmegen, the Netherlands: Wolf Legal Publishers.

Lindström P & Leijonram E, (2007). The Swedish prison system. *Ministry of Justice*. Available from:
http://www.internationalpenalandpenitentiaryfoundation.org/Site/documents/Stavern/29_Stavern_Report%20Sweden.pdf [April 13 2015].

Lipsey M W & Cullen F T, (2007). The effectiveness of correctional rehabilitation: a review of systematic reviews. *The Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 3, 297-320.

Marklund F & Holmberg S, (2009). Effects of early release from prison using electronic tagging in Sweden. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 5, 41-61.

Manson A, (1997). The structure of the Canadian sentencing system. *Federal Sentencing Reporter*, 9(5), 235-238.

McCavitt C M, (2013). Eugenics and human rights in Canada: the Alberta sexual sterilization act of 1928. *Journal of Peace and Conflict*, 19(4), 362-366.

McCoy T, (2012). *Hard time: reforming the penitentiary in nineteenth-century Canada*. Edmonton, Canada: Athabasca University Press.

Ministry of Child and Youth Services Ontario (2000). Risk assessment model for child protection in Ontario, revised. Available from:
[http://www.canadacourtwatch.com/legal_documents/Risk%20Assessment%20Model%20for%20child%20protection%20in%20Ontario%20\(2000\).pdf](http://www.canadacourtwatch.com/legal_documents/Risk%20Assessment%20Model%20for%20child%20protection%20in%20Ontario%20(2000).pdf) [April 2 2016].

Ministry of Justice (1997). Our collective responsibility. *National Council for Crime Prevention Sweden*. Available from:
<http://www.regeringen.se/contentassets/ed27de7824124efca35d6f2eb7f14806/our-collective-responsibility> [April 1 2016].

Ministry of Justice (2015). The Swedish judicial system. Available from:
<http://www.government.se/contentassets/9ebb0750780245aeb6d5c13c1ff5cf64/the-swedish-judicial-system.pdf> [January 21 2016].

Morieux R, (2013). French prisoners of war, conflicts of honour, and social

inversions in England. *The Historical Journal*, 56, 55-88.

Motiuk L, (1994). Classification for correctional programming: the offender intake assessment (OIA) process. *Research Branch, Correctional Service Canada*. Available from: <http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/text/pblct/forum/special/a5e.pdf> [April 3 2016].

Nellis M & Bungerefeldt J, (2013). Electronic monitoring and probation in Sweden and England and Wales: comparative policy developments. *Probation Journal*, 60(3), 278-301.

Paparozzi M A & Gendreau P, (2005). An intensive supervision program that worked: service delivery, professional orientation, and organizational supportiveness. *The Prison Journal*, 85(4), 445-466.

Parole Board of Canada (2015). History of parole in Canada. Available from: <http://pbc-clcc.gc.ca/about/hist-eng.shtml#1> [April 10 2016].

Persson A & Svensson K, (2011). Signs of resistance? Swedish probation officers' attitudes towards risk assessments. *European Journal of Probation*, 3(3), 95-107.

Persson A & Svensson K, (2012). Shades of professionalism: risk assessment in presentence reports in Sweden. *European Journal of Criminology* 9(2), 176-190.

Petersilia J, (2004). What works in prison reentry? Reviewing and questioning the evidence. *Federal Probation*, 68(2), 4-8.

Petrunik M G, (2002). Managing unacceptable risk: sex offenders, community response and social policy in the United States and Canada. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 46(4), 483-511.

Pinto S & Nellis M, (2012). Survey of Electronic monitoring in Europe: analysis of questionnaires 2012. *Confederation of European Probation*. Available from: <http://www.coe.int/t/DGHL/STANDARDSETTING/PRISONS/PCCP%20documents%202013/Analysis%20questionnaires%202012.pdf> [April 28 2016].

Public Safety Canada (2010). Corrections and conditional release in Canada: a general primer. Available from: <http://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/rsrscs/pblctns/2010-03-ccrgp/2010-03-ccrgp-eng.pdf> [May 1 2016].

Public Safety Committee (2012). Public safety and national security meeting February 9th, 2012. *OpenParliament*. Available from: <https://openparliament.ca/committees/public-safety/41-1/23/?page=6> [May 2 2016].

Renzema M & Mayao-Wilson E, (2005). Can electronic monitoring reduce crime for moderate to high-risk offenders? *Journal of Experimental Criminology* 1, 1-23.

Rokkan T, Phillips J, Lulei M, Poledna S & Kensey A, (2015). How was your day? Exploring a day in the life of probation workers across Europe using practice diaries. *European Journal of Probation*, 7(3), 201-217.

Samra-Grewal J & Roesch R, (2000). The parole attitude scale (PAS): development of a 15-item scale to assess attitudes toward conditional release. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 42(2), 157-175.

Sjöstedt G & Långström N, (2001). Actuarial assessment of sex offender recidivism risk: a cross-validation of the RRASOR and the Stat-99 in Sweden. *Law and Human Behavior*, 25(6), 629-645.

Statistics Canada (2015). Adult correctional statistics in Canada, 2013/2014. Available from: <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2015001/article/14163-eng.htm> [November 1 2015].

Swedish Prison and Probation Service (2016a). Facts on probation. Available from: <https://www.kriminalvarden.se/om-kriminalvarden/> [November 1 2015].

Swedish Prison and Probation Service (2016b). Probation. Available from: <https://www.kriminalvarden.se/swedish-prison-and-probation-service/probation/> [October 31 2015].

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (2012). Current best practices for the treatment of offenders in Canada. Available from: <https://www.unodc.org/documents/justice-and-prison-reform/EGM-Uploads/CANADA-GOV-10-En.pdf> [May 21 2016].

Vitopoulos N A, Peterson-Badali M & Skilling T A, (2012). The relationship between matching service to criminogenic need and recidivism in male and female youth. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 39(8), 1025-1041.

Walters G D, (1992). Foundations of criminal science volume 2: the use of knowledge. New York, United States: Praeger Publishing.

Walters S T, Vader A M, Nguyen N, Harris T R & Eells J, (2010). Motivational interviewing as a supervision strategy in probation: a randomized effectiveness trial. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation* 49(5), 309-323.

Wennerberg I & Holmberg S, (2007). Extended use of electronic tagging in Sweden: the offenders' and the victims' view. *National Council for Crime Prevention Sweden*. Available from: https://www.bra.se/download/18.cba82f7130f475a2f1800024290/1371914733858/2007_3_extended_use_of_electronic_tagging.pdf [April 2 2016].

Wessel M, (2015). Castration of male sex offenders in the Nordic welfare state in the

context of homosexuality and heteronormativity. *Scandinavian Journal of History*, 40(5), 591-609.

Whitehead J T & Lindquist C A, (1992). Determinants of probation and parole officer professional orientation. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 20(20), 13-24.

Wolfe N, Blitz C L, Shi J, Siegel J & Bachman R, (2007). Physical violence inside prisons: rates of victimization. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 20(10), 1-12.

Yeh S S, (2010). Cost-benefit analysis of reducing crime through electronic monitoring of parolees and probationers. *Journal of Criminal Justice* 38, 1090-1096.