

CRIMINOGENIC NEEDS OF THE OFFENDERS: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW

Reena Sharma*

Abstract

Criminogenic needs have come under the attention of those providing treatment interventions and services to offenders. During the last few years, there has been a shift in the method of treating offenders: from punishment to rehabilitation. Criminogenic needs, among many others, are viewed as primary intervention targets. It is very important to work on the criminogenic needs of offenders so that better work can be done on their rehabilitation. This paper presents review of important scholarly works that have been previously done on criminogenic needs and is also theoretical in nature. Through the writings of various authors, the paper makes one to understand the definition of criminogenic needs, why it is important in the rehabilitation of offenders and how it can be applied in creating psychological intervention programs. It therefore concentrated on understanding how criminogenic needs influence the behaviour of offenders in committing crimes.

It also analyses how addressing this issue will help further in reducing crime. Focusing on criminogenic needs provides better possibilities to the offenders for living in a good manner or leading worthwhile lives that takes into consideration each individual's capacities, situations, inquisitiveness, and scopes. It also discusses the Risk-Needs-Responsivity Model that has emerged to be a dominant paradigm in the risk and needs assessment. The indication for practice and research of understanding more about criminogenic needs in treating offenders are considered.

Key words: *Criminogenic, punishment, offenders, analyse*

Introduction

*Founder & Forensic Psychologist The Mind Practice, PhD Candidate, Raksha Shakti University, Lavad Campus, Gujarat

What are criminogenic needs?

Bonta and Andrews (1998) defined criminogenic needs as the dynamic attributes of offenders and their circumstances. These are associated with reduced rates of recidivism when the undergo changes (Ward and Stewart, 2010). The attributes include “**pro-offending attitudes and values, aspects of antisocial personality (e.g., impulsiveness), poor problem solving, substance abuse, high hostility and anger, and criminal associates**” (Ward and Stewart, 2010, p. 127). Criminogenic needs therefore are a further set of factors that are predictive of recidivism.

Importance of criminogenic needs

Programs should ensure that the majority of their interventions are focused on anti-social attitudes, anti-social peer associations, substance abuse, lack of problem solving and self-control skills, lack of empathy and other factors that are correlated with criminal conduct (Latesa and Lowenkamp, 2005). Programs which target more criminogenic needs have a better chance to reduce recidivism (Latesa and Lowenkamp, 2005). This is why it is necessary to understand and study the basic needs of an offender to finally work on her/his rehabilitation.

Rehabilitation programs should target criminogenic needs theory, which is connected to recidivism and which is open to change (Andrews and Bonta, 1998). The needs should be detected for every individual type of crime rather than general crimes (Ward and Stewart, 2003). The correct recognition of risk factors and the development of proper measures will ultimately lead to the effectiveness of this program that caters to offender rehabilitation (Ward and Stewart, 2003).

The notion of criminogenic needs is taken under consideration, whereby the offender characteristics with a lower rate of recidivism are targeted. According to Ward and Stewart (2003), this notion should be implemented in order to construct rehabilitation programs. The theory of criminogenic needs explains the attributes and circumstances of offenders and how, post-change, they are related with very low levels of recidivism (Andrews and Bonta, 1998). Therefore criminogenic needs theory focuses on working only

on those characteristics that will ultimately lead to fewer criminals going back to prison.

Objectives

Considering the background of the available literature on criminogenic needs, the objectives of this paper are:

1. To understand how criminogenic needs influence the behaviour of offenders in committing crime.
2. To analyse how addressing this will be helpful in reducing crime.

Brief Review of literature

This succeeding section reflected on the existing literature on criminogenic needs, its guiding principles, how it is being used both in theory and practice (specifically outside India), the assessments and models that are present outside India, and also briefly discusses the criminogenic needs of female offenders and its relevance. The literature creates a base that upholds the need for implementing criminogenic needs and its models in both theory and practice in India.

Risk/need factors

The first major set of risk need factors is anti-social/pro criminal attitudes, values, beliefs and cognitive-emotional states (Latessa, n.d.). Cognitive emotional state includes rage, anger, defiance and criminal identity. The way to identify pro criminal attitudes, values and beliefs is to listen for negative expressions about the law, negative expressions about conventional institutions, values, rules and procedures (including authority). Negative expressions about self-management of behavior (including problem solving ability), adverse attitudes toward self and one's capability to achieve through conventional means, and also lack of sensibility and thoughtfulness toward others (Latessa, n.d.).

The second major set of risk need factors is pro-criminal associates and isolation from pro-social others (Latessa, n.d.). The third set is temperamental and anti-social personality pattern conducive to criminal

activity (Latessa, n.d.) that also includes weak socialization, impulsivity, adventure seeking mentality, pleasure seeking, restless aggressive, egocentrism, below average verbal intelligence, attraction towards risk and weak sense of problem solving. Previous evidence of antisocial behavior from an early age in different settings and involvement of different acts is the fourth set of risk/need factors (Latessa, n.d.).

Even family factors like insufficient caring and cohesiveness, low levels of affection, poor parental supervision, low levels of affection, and neglect and abuse discipline practices are responsible factors for criminal conduct. Low levels of personal, educational and financial achievement, or involvement in prosocial leisure activities and substance abuse are all risk factors (Latessa, n.d.).

Criminogenic needs factors are identified with dynamic hazard factors and allude to qualities of the adolescent that, when changed, are related with changes in danger of reoffending (Development Services Group, 2015). For instance, substance use is a hazard factor yet can likewise be a criminogenic needs factor if an adolescent's substance use is identified with both men and women's unethical conduct. If an adolescent's substance use is focused on and treated appropriately, his or her hazard to reoffend ought to be diminished. There are additionally qualities known as non-criminogenic needs factors. These are dynamic hazard factors that may demonstrate a requirement for treatment or programming for the young; notwithstanding, they are not identified with reprobate conduct. Low confidence is a prime case of a non criminogenic factor. In spite of the fact that an adolescent's low confidence may propose a need for directing, it's anything but a hazard factor for wrongdoing, and changing an adolescent's confidence level won't change the probability of reoffending (Development Services Group 2015).

Guiding principles of criminogenic needs

Having discussed the risk/need factors inbuilt in criminogenic needs, it is important to focus on the guiding principles of criminogenic needs and its relevance in the rehabilitation process of offenders. The four main principles of classification to guide effective correctional treatment have been formulated by Bonta and Andrews (Ward and Stewart, 2010). The first one is

risk principle. The risk principle has two aspects: (1) prediction of criminal behavior, and (2) match between the level of treatment risk and risk level of the offender (James, 2014). It holds that regulation and treatment levels should coordinate the offenders' level of risk.

The Need rule posit that treatment administrations should focus on an offender's dynamic risk components or criminogenic needs to diminish an offender's tendency to return to criminal activities. The needs principle posits that effective treatment should concentrate on tending to criminogenic needs, that is, dynamic risk factors that are profoundly interconnected with criminal conduct (James, 2014).

The Responsivity principle explains that psychological interventions for offenders should utilize cognitive social learning techniques and be custom fitted to an individual offender's particular attributes that influence successful program results (Casey et al., 2014). The responsivity principle is additionally separated into two components. The general responsivity principle expresses that cognitive-behavioral and social learning therapies are the best type of intervention. The particular responsivity principle expresses that treatment ought to consider the relevant qualities of the offenders (e.g., offender's motivations, preferences, personality, age, gender, ethnicity, and cultural identification, along with other factors) (James, 2014). The principle of professional discretion (Ward and Stewart, 2010) expresses that clinical judgment should supersede the above standards if circumstances allow it. This guideline considers treatment adaptability and advancement in specific situations (Ward and Stewart, 2010).

Criminogenic needs in theory and practice

Understanding criminogenic needs of offenders is an important part of their rehabilitation process. Researchers have discussed why it is necessary to implement criminogenic needs models in practice (Osher et al., 2012; James, 2015, 2018; Casey et al., 2014; Latessa and Lowenkamp, 2005; Veldhuis, 2012; Gideon, 2013; Ward and Stewart, 2003; Polaschek, 2013; Zeng et al., 2014; OJJDP, 2015; Holin and Palmer, 2010). The emergence of criminogenic needs go back to the 1980s. It reveals needs which causes criminal behavior (Baird, 2017). Osher et al. (2012) divides criminogenic risk

factors into static and dynamic. The former indicates those that cannot be altered, such as an individual's demographics and the age during his first arrest. The latter, that is, dynamic risk factors are susceptible to change and amenable to interventions. The eight dynamic risk factors as recognized by researchers are presence of antisocial personality pattern, antisocial behaviour, antisocial cognition, antisocial associates, family and/or marital, leisure and/or recreation and school and/or work, substance abuse (Osher et al., 2012: 23; James, 2015; Baird, 2017; Latessa and Lowenkamp, 2005). The four main among these are anti-social cognition, anti-social companions, anti-social personality/temperament, family and/or marital (Reno NV. 2013). These factors place a person at a risky position for future criminal behavior.

Individuals who are at higher risk for recidivism should get treatment resources and correctional facility programming. This is determined by a composite score of both static and dynamic risk factors. This is similar even for those who are on probation or parole for receiving treatment and supervision resources. The need for supervision increases for those whose criminogenic risk is also on a higher level (Osher et al 2012).

The treatment and supervision services that deals with criminogenic risk and need are created in order to improve an individual's problem-solving skills, reduce his or her criminal thinking and help limit his or her interactions with antisocial peers (Osher et al 2012). It has been recommended to identify criminogenic risk factors at initial stages of criminal justice involvement. Reassessment of individuals should be done in case dynamic risk factors change (Osher et al. 2012).

Criminogenic needs and dynamic risk factors, have become the focal point of a lot of research and are seen as essential intervention targets. An advanced idea of requirements inserted in the thought of human prosperity, can give a reasonable coherent conceptual basis to rehabilitation and furthermore do away with problems relevant to the concept of criminogenic needs (Ward and Stewart, 2003). From this point of view, they further argue that criminogenic requirements are understood as the external and internal obstructions related with need distortion. Subsequently, they are legitimately connected to basic need distortion and the nonappearance of

the internal and external conditions important for an individual to live a content life.

There is a requirement for research inspecting the interrelationship of criminogenic needs, certain responsivity factors, and instructive results of youth on probation. Discoveries likewise bolster recent initiatives that give solid training to probation officers around execution of the need and responsivity principles in effective management of the cases of youth who are involved in justice (Haqanee et al., 2015).

Criminal thinking styles differentiate between people who commit crimes and those who do not independent of mental illness (Haqanee et al., 2015). The imprisoned ones with mental illness are often mentally ill and criminal. The needs should be treated as co-occurring problems (Latessa, n.d).

Getting back to normal life after prison is not a smooth process for inmates. Offenders are confronted with various issues that affect the re-entry process and increase the chances of recidivism. Transforming violent offenders into peaceful and law abiding citizens is one thing, but keeping them away from violence in the near future is another. To make the process a successful one, it is essential to address criminogenic needs in the offenders' immediate environment. This also involves establishing a safe and trusting social network for the offenders to return to society and normal life (Veldhuis, 2012).

Risk needs assessment

Research shows that actual approaches to problems are more important and relevant than intuitive judgements. This holds true in a variety of contexts, including recidivism risk. There are legislative propositions to actualize a risk and needs evaluation framework in federal prison outside India. The framework would be utilized to put detainees in rehabilitative programs (James, 2015). A risk and needs assessment instrument (James, 2014) estimates offenders' criminal risk variables and explicit needs that if tended to will lessen the probability of future crime. Evaluation instruments normally comprise of a progression of inquiries that help direct an interview with an offender so as to gather information on practices and mentalities

that are connected to recidivism risks. Data gathered during the interview is ordinarily enhanced with data from criminal history records check. A complete score is determined utilizing the risk and needs assessment instrument (James, 2014), and that score puts the offender into a risk category (for example, "low," "moderate," or "high") (James, 2014). RNA (Risk and Needs Assessment) information is significant to judges making conclusions with respect to offender's manageability to community supervision and states of probation in condemning and revocation hearings (Casey et al., 2014).

These instruments can predict who is at risk for recidivism. These are used in pre-trial detention, sentencing, probation/post release supervision, prison and parole boards and releasing authorities (James, 2015, p. 4) Including needs that are hardly identified with results on a risk assessment are bound to have critical ramifications on the instrument's capacity. Risk instruments ought to contain just those variables that produce the most elevated level of segregation between recidivism rates for people who are at various risk levels (Baird, 2017). Needs should be studied separately for case-planning and service-delivery purposes. Bringing both on a single scale might conflate the roles of group and individual data (Baird, 2017). A few RNA instruments depend on the risk need-responsivity (RNR) model.

Risk-Need Responsivity (RNR)

Wooditch et al. (2014) explains that the risk need–responsivity (RNR) model depends on the premise that fitting treatment and controls for offenders ought to be founded on criminal justice, risk and criminogenic need factors that are identified with offending behaviors. Allocating the suitable dosage, kind of controls, and restorative programming will lead to decreases in criminal offending. The theory underlying this is that offending is a result of the historical backdrop of criminal justice involvement and certain criminogenic needs. By taking care of dynamic criminogenic needs through legitimate treatment and control programming, one can influence offending behavior (Wooditch et al., 2014).

The main requisites of the model are: (an) interceding to assist offenders in reducing their criminal activities will benefit them and the network around

them, and (b) that the best way to meditate successfully is through empathetic, cooperative, and dignified human service intervention whose main target is on factors that predict criminal conduct (Polaschek, 2012). Correctional rehabilitation is generally resourced by, and responsible to government; in spite of the fact that offenders have indistinguishable rights as others do to help with every aspect of their working (e.g., mental and physical wellbeing). There are no mandates in the correctional programmes which do not address the needs to reduce involvement in crime (Blanchette and Brown, 2006). The RNR is a framework that encompasses fundamental conditions that ought to be met in different types of interventions. Future projects might have the option to follow most of the principles, and in progressively compelling ways, because mid-level theorists and program developers try new ideas and theories and also bring development in other intervention domains (Polaschek, 2012).

The RNR model of rehabilitation remains the "premier rehabilitation theory" (Ward, et al., 2007, p. 222) till it keeps on appreciating strong empirical support, and as long as logical information are held in higher regard than "truthness". The accomplishments of the RNR model are very astounding: creating more and more, advancing from the mess of pretense, disarray and conflicting discoveries that went before "what works" (Latessa, Cullen, and Gendreau, 2002) a misleadingly straightforward arrangement of standards to control offender rehabilitation.

Most of the research pertaining to the risk-needs model has been carried out with male offenders, leading to questions about the criminogenic needs of women offenders and whether there may be women-specific criminogenic needs (Holin and Palmer, 2006).

Criminogenic needs of female offenders

An outline of criminogenic needs, as evaluated by the LSI-R (Level of Service Inventory-Revised) (LSI-R; Andrews and Bonta, 1995), recommends that there are most likely basic requirements for male and female offenders (Holin and Palmer, 2006). A typical need doesn't suggest that aetiology or level of significance of that need is the equivalent for people, while some events, for example, physical and sexual abuse, are seemingly criminogenic

requirements for women. The suggestions for practice and research for understanding increasingly about women-specific criminogenic needs are considered. The criminogenic needs of male and female offenders overlap at some point. The evidence proposes that certain factors, for example, finance, accommodation, education, employment, and substance use might be criminogenic requirements for men and women (Holin and Palmer, 2006). It stays dubious whether these elements have a similar etiology and level of significance for people. There is a contention that some criminogenic needs are women-specific (or even male-specific) and, for sure, the evidence shows that some unfavorable life events are more characteristic of female than male offenders.

Keeping this in mind, Blanchette (2002) proposes, risk might be 'gendered' in that a portion of the criminogenic needs of women are distinctive to those of men. A blend of the longitudinal methodology as put into use by Moffitt et al. (2001) and the fine-grained analysis as announced by Suter et al. (2002), is important to build gender-specific version of pathways that lead to offending and recidivism. Explanation of such pathways for women would bring up understanding of the basic collaborations between unfavorable life events and psychological variables, so illuminating comprehension regarding their status as criminogenic needs.

When it comes to the criminogenic needs of male and female offenders, a detailed and very often change in the criminal history is not one of the characteristics of women offenders which might be expected from the male offenders. Academic studies have shown that violent women offenders show higher levels of need. They are associated with drug users, have financial problems and also more personal and emotional problems. Therefore there is a possibility that female sex offenders have high criminogenic needs (Holin and Palmer, 2010).

Survey conducted by Van Voorhis and Presser (2001) showed that female offenders have certain unique needs like dealing with "trauma issues, self-esteem and assertiveness, abuse, medical care, parenting and child care, mental health, and relationships" (p.188). Women specific criminogenic needs are categorised in the personal/emotional domain. Even when there has been evidence of some criminogenic needs to be women specific, yet

there stands a probability of the wrongful translation of women-specific needs into criminogenic needs. Therefore there are risk factors for offending leading to overestimation of assessed risk. If there is no proper explanation of what represents a criminogenic need specific to women offenders, then it will lead to incorrect assessment of risk with women offenders (Holin and Palmer, 2010).

Discussion

The following section discusses the literature reviewed above and also critically reviews the RNR model as well as the risk and needs assessment. Ward and Stewart (2010) have built up a needs based framework to assist the comprehension of the reasons for offending and to direct the assessment and rehabilitation of offenders. In their hypothesis the goals and wants of people are mostly controlled by their central interests and concerns, that is, their fundamental needs. Fundamental needs are helpfully translated as innate inclinations to take part in specific exercises that, if not met, bring about harm in future. Instances of essential or clear cut needs are relatedness, autonomy, and competency. Regardless of whether essential needs can be met in a way that will advance a person's prosperity depends vitally on the presence of explicit internal and external conditions. Internal conditions are psychological characteristics such as skills, beliefs, attitudes and values. External conditions suggest social, social, and relational factors that encourage the improvement of the above psychological qualities and incorporate compelling parenting, instruction, professional training, social underpins and the chance to seek after valued goals (Ward and Stewart, 2010).

The needs based system and by augmentation the RNR model, is likewise a promising method to address youth sexual offending and as an initial step it would distinguish the risk and criminogenic needs connected with youth sexual offending.

Zeng et al's. (2014) study attempted to inspect if there were any qualifications in the risk and criminogenic needs of two typologies of sexual offenders: (a) young people who insulted just sexually versus youth who annoyed

sexually and nonsexually and (b) youth who expressly offended against child victims people versus youth who sexually against nonchild victims.

The finding that both sexual and nonsexual offenders had higher general criminogenic needs in comparison to only sexual offenders, proposes that general criminogenic risk and needs may impact the sexual offending carried out by diverse criminal youth who sexually offended. Butler and Seto (2002) argue that these outcomes may likewise be reliable with research suggesting that both sexual and non sexual youth offenders bear are similar to nonsexual youth offenders in their group characteristics. The outcomes in the above mentioned study are on similar pedestal with research suggesting that adult sex offenders vary in two general risk dimensions—sexual deviance (e.g., atypical sexual interests, unnecessary sexual distraction) and general antisocial orientation, for example antisocial personality, attitudes, and beliefs (Pullman and Seto, 2012). The present study (Zeng et al., 2014) has discovered not many contrasts in sexual and general risk and needs between youth who explicitly offended against child victims and youth who explicitly offended against nonchild victims. Be that as it may, critical contrasts in risk and needs identifying with psychosocial functioning were found among criminally various youth who unequivocally annoyed in contrast with youth who outraged just explicitly. Such discoveries should give an increasingly imperative perception of youth sexual offending and may help support individualized evaluation and treatment of youth who sexually offended (Zeng et al., 2014).

Research should also be done to develop a precise need and risk gender-specific measure so that better informed decision making could be built. It is clear that the criminogenic needs of men and women offenders overlap (Hollin and Palmer, 2006). The evidence proposes that components, for example, fund, settlement, instruction, work, and substance use might be criminogenic requirements for both genders. It remains questionable whether these elements have a similar etiology and level of significance for male and female offenders. In applied work, the degree of significance of assessed need concerning its association with offending is significant for two reasons. Firstly, on the off chance that an assessment features a specific criminogenic need, at that point administrations might be called upon to address that need. Holin and Palmer (2006) further argue that if the

particular need is not addressed appropriately then it may lead to inappropriate level of intervention. Secondly, on the off chance that criminogenic needs are converted into risk estimates for further offending, at that point inappropriate needs assessment may misleadingly increase or decrease risk. The issue here might be one of scale alignments for males and females. Clear measurement of the criminogenic needs of female offenders will lead to better services (Hollin and Palmer, 2006)

Research recommends that assessment instruments can make differentiations between high and low risk offenders with some level of accuracy. Also, assessment systems that cling to the RNR guideline have all the prerequisites of being effective in reducing recidivism. Actualizing an evaluation framework in federal prisons would show up, in light of the current research, to be an evidence based approach to improve the adequacy of rehabilitative programming, and when joined with extra time credits for certain detainees who partake in rehabilitative programs and productive activities, it may give a way to lessen the population of the federal prison without expanding the risk to public security (James, 2014).

The RNR model's explanatory profundity inspite of its relevance in understanding criminogenic needs, is limited in a few key regions. For instance, in spite of its centrality to the model, the responsivity principle is the least created of the three main principles (Andrews and Bonta, 2010; see Dowden and Andrews, 2004, for a special case). It is theoretically unsophisticated: a catch-all category. However it contains a lot of what makes the utilization of the model both altruistic and powerful, so its underdevelopment may have significant outcomes (Ogloff and Davis, 2004). Andrews, et al. (2011) recognize that an absence of clarity and comprehensibility may have added to a portion of the reactions levelled at their model, and also, that way of presenting may even have lacked attractiveness (Andrews and Bonta, 2010a).

The utilization of risk and needs assessment in the juvenile justice system has been developing since the 1990s (Schwalbe, 2008). Risk/needs assessments are intended to consolidate greater objectivity into the way toward deciding the potential dangers of reoffending among adolescents who have come into contact with the justice system, and to aid the

improvement of individualized treatment alternatives dependent on young people's distinguished needs. In spite of the fact that risk/needs assessments attempt to remove some discretion and subjectivity from the justice system and include significant elements that have appeared in research to be firmly connected with delinquent or problem behaviors, there are still some significant restrictions to these evaluations that ought to be considered (OJJDP, 2015).

It must be pointed out here that we are addressing criminogenic needs and its implications separately. This paper discusses assessments and instruments that have been used abroad. Criminogenic needs (needs which make one commit crime) in respect of future criminal behavior (offending that a person might do in future) have implications for educational and workplace policies and criminogenic needs in respect of recidivism (reoffending now) have implications for correctional service policy.

Conclusion

In this paper, a few relevant scholarly works on criminogenic needs have been reviewed and its importance in the psychological intervention programs. Criminogenic needs, or the basic requirements that lead an offender in engaging themselves in criminal activities have come under the purview of correctional settings over the last few years. The recent correctional settings are concentrating more on the rehabilitation of the offenders rather than just punishing them for their criminal activities. A validated risk and needs assessment instrument and its usage in treatment of offenders is the only component of an evidence-based approach to reduce offender recidivism. Research should focus on the larger picture of this component which also includes supervision and treatment resources to an offender's risk factors. Treatments should use cognitive-behavioral skill building techniques and make way for programs that will focus on gender specific criminogenic needs as well. The risk need responsivity (RNR) model is one such program that has focused on the offender rehabilitation. Future research should cater to more of its principles in effective ways.

By discussing criminogenic needs in theory, this paper introduces the need to introduce it in practice as well since the concept is not present in India.

The paper discusses the performance perspective by elaborating on the instruments, their use and benefits. After careful study of literature and observation in the prison settings, the effectiveness of therapeutic interventions, 'Samarth' was introduced as India's first pioneering Therapeutic rehabilitation intervention program for offenders based on Forensic CBT (Cognitive Behavioral Therapy), philosophy of positive criminology as well as criminogenic needs. The first centre was formally inaugurated in February 2018, in Sabarmati Central Prison, Ahmedabad. In February 2019 Samarth was extended to all the central Prisons of Gujarat, Lajour, Surat, Rajkot, Baroda besides Ahmedabad (Sharma, 2019). The implication for future research is very clear: bringing in risk and needs assessments, RNR models, therapeutic programs and criminogenic needs instruments to enhance the rehabilitation process of the offenders.

References

1. Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (1995). *The Level of Service Inventory-Revised*. Toronto: Multi-Health Systems.
2. Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (2010a). *The Psychology of Criminal Conduct* (5th ed.). Newark, N.J.: Matthew Bender.
3. Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (2010b). Rehabilitating criminal justice policy and practice. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 16, 39-55.
4. Andrews, D. A., Bonta, J., & Wormith, J. S. (2011). The Risk-Need Responsivity model: Does the Good Lives Model contribute to effective crime prevention? *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 38, 735-755. doi: 10.1177/0093854811406356
5. Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (1998). *The psychology of criminal conduct* (2nd ed.). Cincinnati OH: Anderson.
6. Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (2006). *The psychology of criminal conduct* (4th ed.). Newark, NJ: Matthew Bender.
7. Blanchette, K. (2002). *Classifying female offenders for effective intervention: Application of the*
8. *case-based principles of risk and need*. *Forum on Correctional Research*, 14, 31-35.
9. Blanchette, K., & Brown, S. L. (2006). *The assessment and treatment of women offenders: An integrative perspective*. Chichester, UK: Wiley.

10. Bonta, J., & Andrews, D. A. (2007). Risk-Need-Responsivity model for offender assessment and rehabilitation. (Report no. 2007-06). Ottawa, Canada: Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada. Retrieved from www.publicsafety.gc.ca/res/cor/rep/risk_need_200706-eng.aspx.
11. Butler, S. M., & Seto, M. C. (2002). Distinguishing two types of adolescent sex offenders. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 41, 83-90. doi:10.1097/00004583-200201000-00015
12. Casey, P. M., Elek, J. K., Warren, R. K., Cheesman, F., Kleiman, M., & Ostrom, B. (2014). Offender Risk & Needs Assessment Instruments: A Primer for Courts. National Center for State Courts, 1–32.
13. Dowden, C., & Andrews, D. A. (2004). The importance of staff practice in delivering effective correctional treatment: A meta-analytic review of core correctional practice. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 48, 203-214.
14. Gideon, L. A. (n.d.). Cognitive, criminogenic, and cultural styles of Aboriginal and Caucasian offenders in Northern Ontario (Unpublished master's thesis).
15. Haqanee, Z., Peterson-Badali, M & Skilling, T. (2015) Making “What Works” Work: Examining Probation Officers’ Experiences Addressing the Criminogenic Needs of Juvenile Offenders, *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 54(1), 37-59.
16. Hollin, C. R., & Palmer, E. J. (2006). Criminogenic need and women offenders: A critique of the literature. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 11(2), 179-195.
17. James, N. (2015). Risk and Needs Assessment in the Criminal Justice System. Congressional Research Service.
18. Latessa, E. J., Cullen, F. T., & Gendreau, P. (2002). Beyond correctional quackery: Professionalism and the possibility of effective treatment. *Federal Probation*, 66, 43-49.
19. Latessa, E. J., & Lowenkamp, C. (2005). What are criminogenic needs and why are they important? *For the Record*.
20. Moffitt, T. E., Caspi, A., Rutter, M., & Silva, P. A. (2001). Sex differences in antisocial behaviour: Conduct disorder, delinquency, and violence in the Dunedin Longitudinal Study. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

21. Ogloff, J. R. P., & Davis, M. R. (2004). Advances in offender assessment and rehabilitation: Contributions of the risk-needs-responsivity approach. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 10, 229-242. Doi: 10.1080/10683160410001662735
22. Osher, F., D'Amora, D. A., Potkin, M., Jarrett, N., & Eggleston, A. (2012). Adults with Behavioral health Needs under Correctional supervision: A Shared Framework for Reducing Recidivism and Promoting Recovery. Council of State Governments Justice Center Criminal Justice/Mental Health Consensus Project.
23. Polaschek, D. L. (2012). An appraisal of the risk-need-responsivity (RNR) model of offender rehabilitation and its application in correctional treatment. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 17(1), 1-17.
24. Pullman, L., & Seto, M. C. (2012). Assessment and treatment of adolescent sexual offenders: Implications of recent research on generalist versus specialist explanations. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 36, 203-209. doi:10.1016/j.chiabu.2011.11.003.
25. Sharma, R. (2019). "Samarth - Breaking Barriers" Therapeutic Intervention Program Rationale and Effectiveness in Sabarmati Central Prison Ahmedabad, Gujarat. *The Indian Police Journal*, 66(4), 170-179.
26. Sharma, R. (2019). Therapeutic Interventions & Treatment Readiness In Violent Offenders: An Impact Assessment At Sabarmati Prison, Gujarat (Unpublished doctoral thesis). Raksha Shakti University, Ahmedabad.
27. Schwalbe, Craig S. 2008. A Meta-Analysis of Juvenile Justice Risk Assessment Instruments: Predictive Validity by Gender." *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 35(11),1367-81.
28. Suter, J. M., Byrne, M. K., Byrne, S., Howells, K., & Day, A. (2002). Anger in prisoners: Women are different from men. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 32, 1087-1100.
29. Taylor, J. (n.d.). The criminogenic needs of offenders with intellectual disability and personality disorder (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Birmingham.
30. Van Voorhis, P., & Presser, L. (2001). Classification of women offenders: A national assessment of current practices. Washington, DC: the National Institute of Corrections.
31. Ward, T., & Stewart, C. (2003). Criminogenic needs and human needs: A theoretical model. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 9(2), 125-143.

32. Ward, T., Melsner, J., & Yates, P. M. (2007). Reconstructing the risk, need, responsivity model: A theoretical elaboration and evaluation. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 12, 208-228.
33. Wooditch, A., Tang, L.L & Taxman, F.S. (2014) Which Criminogenic need changes are most important in promoting desistance from crime and substance use? *Criminal Justice Behavior*, 42(3), 276-299.
34. Zeng, G., Chu, C. M., Koh, L. L., & Teoh, J. (2014). Risk and Criminogenic Needs of Youth Who Sexually Offended in Singapore. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 27(5), 479-495.