Revija za kriminalistiko in kriminologijo / Ljubljana 70 / 2019 / 4, 323–334

Criminal Lifestyle and Criminal Thinking Style as Predictors of the Results of Monitoring Activity of the Convicts in the Process of (Re)Classification

Žana Vrućinić[1]

The aim of this research is to provide an insight into the correlation between criminal behavioural styles and criminal styles of thinking with the results of monitoring the activities of convicted persons in the process of (re)classification. Criminal behavioural styles were measured with the Lifestyle Criminality Screening Form score (LCSF) (Walters, White, & Denney, 1991), and criminal styles of thinking were measured with the Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles (PICTS) (Walters, 1995, 2005). This could identify and eliminate eight styles of thinking and four styles of behaviour characterizing a criminal lifestyle. The sample for this research consisted of 126 inmates of Banja Luka Correctional Facility. Seven out of eight criminal styles of thinking (mollification, cut-off, entitlement, power orientation, superoptimism, cognitive indolence and discontinuity) are negatively correlated with results of monitoring the activities of convicted persons in terms of thinking. Three out of four criminal behavioural styles (interpersonal intrusiveness, self-indulgence and social rule breaking) are negatively correlated with monitoring the activities of convicted persons in terms of behaviour. The General Criminal Thinking (GCT) score of the PICTS and Total LCSF score was found to successfully predict the result of monitoring the activities of 216 male offenders in the behavioural and thinking segment in the process of prison classification after controlling for age, marital status, level of education, length of sentence and recidivism. These results suggest that the GCT score of the PICTS and LCSF score may have a role in internal classification decisions. The theoretical and practical implications of these findings are discussed.

Keywords: criminal lifestyle, criminal thinking styles, offenders, prison classification

UDC: 343.9

1 Introduction

The criminal lifestyle is a consequence of socialization in which an individual is increasingly involved in criminal activities and identifies with criminal behaviour (Walters, 1998a, 1998b). The lifestyle theory sees a criminal lifestyle as a continuum and not in a dichotomous way. Walters (2006a) states that the lifestyle theory consists of three interrelated models; a structural model, a functional model, and a change model. The purpose of the structural model is to define the lifestyle operatively, to describe its key parts and show how it fits into the wider classification system. The functional model explains the origin, development and purpose of the lifestyle (Walters, 1998a, 1998b) through fears, belief systems and development factors (Walters, 2006a). The third model deals with change. In this model, the mechanisms and processes of lifestyle change are explained in detail.

Structural elements of the criminal life style make up four behavioural styles: interpersonal intrusiveness, irresponsibility, self-indulgence, and social rule breaking. This criminal lifestyle is further proposed to be the result of three factors, namely conditions, choice, and cognition. Conditions are seen as those internal or external factors, such as heredity and family, which determine individual predispositions to adopting a criminal lifestyle. Within these constraints, people then have options or choices about the behaviour and life-styles they pursue. Finally, people will develop cognitive justifications for their behaviour (Walters, 1990). What distinguishes a criminal lifestyle is the development of specific thinking styles. These styles of thinking were created according to the model of the criminal personality of Yochelson and Samenow (1976, 1977), which initially consisted of 52 cognitive errors. Walters (1998a, 1998b) summarized this model in 8 styles of thinking; Mollification (MO), cut-off (CO), entitlement (EN), power orientation (PO), sentimentality (SN), superoptimism (SO), cognitive indolence (CI), and discontinuity (DS).

The questionnaires used in this research came from the criminal lifestyle theory, Lifestyle Criminality Screening

[1] Žana Vrućinić, Ph.D., Assistant Professor, Faculty of Security Sciences, University of Banja Luka, Republic of Srpska.
E-mail: zana.vrucinic@fbn.unibl.org

Form (LCSF) (Walters, White, & Denney, 1991), which measures the level of involvement in the criminal lifestyle, and Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles (PICTS) (Walters, 1995), which measures the criminal style of thinking and have been used in different studies at the sample of convicts to inform risk judgments for institutional misconduct, criminal recidivism, and violence (Walters, 2006b).

In a study by Walters and associates on a sample of convicts on conditional release (Walters, Revella, & Baltrusaitis, 1990), the LCSF questionnaire successfully anticipated their adjustment in the community. The negative outcome is operationalized as the presence of criminal or technical violations of conditional release. In an 18-month follow-up study (Walters & Chlumsky, 1993), high results on the LCSF (total results > or = 10) successfully indicated the convicts who were suspended from probation due to the commission of a new offense. Studies using the revised Psychopathy Checklist-Revised (PCL-R) or (LCSF) to verify the ability to predict community adaptation and recidivism were subjected to the meta-analysis and comparison and similar results were obtained (Walters, 2003b). Applied to institutional adjustment, LCSF scores distinguished between maximum and minimum security inmates (Walters, White, & Denney, 1991). With a minimum security sample, LCSF predicts institutional misconduct over a 6-month period (Walters, 1991).

The predictive validity of the PICTS thinking style and content scales has also been assessed. Criterion measures included disciplinary adjustment while in prison (Walters, 1996), recidivism following release from prison (Walters, 1997) and dropping out of psychological programming (Walters & Di Fazio, 2001). Recidivism was also evaluated in 178 male inmates who were administered the Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles (PICTS) and scored on the Level of Service Inventory-Revised: Screening Version (LSI-R:SV) 1-55 months before their release from prison, whereas prior charges and the PICTS R scale consistently and incrementally predicted serious recidivism (more serious charges) (Walters, 2011). The predictive validity of the PICTS (Cut-off) was shown in a comparative study as well, on a sample of convicts from two different federal prisons–a medium-security federal correctional institution and a maximum-security penitentiary–who were subsequently followed for a period of 24 months for evidence of disciplinary adjustment problems. Disciplinary outcomes were measured by the total number of incident reports, the number of nonaggressive incident reports, and the number of aggressive incident reports received during the 24-month follow-up (Walters, 2006c).

The criminal lifestyle theory by Glenn Walters has been tested in Southeast Europe, especially in Croatia. The predictive validity of the PICTS was verified by the sample of 399 convicts stationed in the Department of Diagnostics and Treatment Programming in Zagreb Prison in the period from March 2004 to June 2005, whereas the result sum at the Level of Service Inventory-Revised - LSI - R (Andrews & Bonta, 1994) was taken as a criterion variable, and PICTS items, that is, eleven factors at the same questionnaire were taken as a predicative variable. The majority of predicators have shown a significant contribution in explaining criterion variable (Doležal & Mikšaj-Todorović, 2008). The same sample of convicts was used to test the factor structure of PICTS (Doležal, 2007). In addition, Doležal (2009) combines the depth of involvement into criminal lifestyle (LCSF) with the age, recidivism and the violence of a criminal offence. Results have shown that there are significant differences in the depth of involvement into criminal lifestyle considering the age, recidivism and the violence of a criminal offence in a way that the youngest interviewees, recidivists and violators are more deeply involved in criminal lifestyle than other convicts.

Jandrić Nišević (2009) combines criminal lifestyle of thinking with age, recidivism, violence, behavioural characteristic of lifestyle, and abuse of means of addiction and provides equally interesting results. The relationship between criminal thinking styles (PICTS) and depth of involvement in criminal lifestyle (LCSF) was verified in the sample of 415 convicts stationed in the Department of Diagnostics and Treatment Programming in Zagreb Prison in the period from December 2007 to February 2009, and it was established that convicts more deeply involved into criminal lifestyles (moderate and deep involvement) have more pronounced criminal styles of thinking (Jandrić Nišević, 2010).

According to our information, the risk assessment tools LCSF and PICTS have not been linked to results in the process of re-classification of convicts so far, so that this research is exploratory.

2 Classification of Convicts versus Recidivism Risk Assessment

This classification aims to differentiate prisoners in terms of security levels and/or various management issues in order to match the needs of convicts with available corrective resources (type of treatment and level of control) (Austin, 2003; Schmalleger & Smykla, 2001). Well-trained and specialized professional staff perform classification duties, including recommendations for increasing, reducing or retaining the level of supervision of perpetrators of a criminal offense. Each classification decision and any consideration required for making a final decision is documented and kept for analysis and (re) examination (Austin, 2003).

After a certain period of time (every three or six months depending on the duration of the sentence of each convict), the convicts are subjected to reclassification.[2] During the reclassification process, the emphasis is placed on the behavior of prisoners during the time of serving prison sentences, such as the degree of participation in the treatment program, the association in gangs, the history of violence and disciplinary offenses (Austin, 2003).

Classification and evaluation of criminal recidivism are two related but different processes within the prison system. In general, risk assessment is the process of classifying perpetrators into groups based on the likelihood of their future criminal behavior (Hamilton, Neuilli, Lee, & Barnoski, 2014), using "group statistics to make individual decisions" (Baird, 2009: 3). Given the impossibility to precisely identify individuals who would commit new crimes, the assessment made by these instruments should be considered "advisory, not imperative" (Latessa & Lovins, 2010). Both processes permeate corrective processes starting from admission to a correctional facility and imprisonment, through serving sentence, release and post-control (Austin, 2003). Classification and evaluation are usually performed by a team of experts that emphasize three objectives: 1) the public need for protection and safety, 2) identification and alignment of the needs of the perpetrator with the provided treatment and effective use of existing resources, and 3) improvement of the corrective process while simultaneously reducing costs and reducing recidivism (Lauren, 1997).

Evaluation is a correction process that is closely related, but it differs from corrective classification. Corrective Assessment Instruments (for the purposes of this research we mention LCSF and PICTS) usually cover two areas – risk and needs of the convicts. *Risk* refers to the estimated harm convicts might do to themselves, the others and the community as a whole, where treatment of high-risk offenders should be more intense (Lowenkamp & Latessa, 2004). The relevant factors to be assessed include the history of criminal behavior, the type of offense (or more) for which (currently) a person is serving the sentence of imprisonment, and the gravity of the offense (crimes with or without elements of violence and crimes against gender integrity). Data on education, employment, financial situation, interpersonal relationships, marital status, adaptation, pro-social recreational opportunities, choice of society, history of antisocial behavior, drug abuse and alcohol abuse, mental status and criminal attitudes, length of sentence and system of criminal justice are considered when assessing the needs of convicts related to the commission of criminal offenses (Andrews & Bonta, 2003).

The *need* principle identifies factors that are empirically related to criminal behavior and are also subject to intervention (e.g., risk factors that can be altered, such as criminal attitudes, unlike those that are not susceptible to change, such as current age or age at the time of the first arrest). In addition, the principle of responsiveness (characteristics of response to intervention) emphasizes the importance of aligning the forms and ways of conducting treatment with the learning styles of the perpetrator and his abilities, and generally with his biosocial and cultural characteristics, all in order to ensure the effectiveness of the treatment (Hollin, Palmer, & Hatcher, 2013; Walters, Clark, Gingerich, & Meltzer, 2007).

The Risk-Need-Responsivity Model is described as a rehabilitation map, which allows prison workers to use valuable corrective resources more efficiently and align them with monitoring needs. Over the past 20 years, research has shown that criminal justice programs are more effective when they work in accordance with the principles of the RNR model (Andrews & Bonta, 2010). The RNR model is incorporated into best practice recommendations by most US criminal justice organizations (Sarver, Prince, Seawright, & Butters, 2015).

The primary purpose of risk screening is to decide on who needs to receive the risk / need treatment and to what extent. Thus, professional criminal justice organizations recommend that all offenders be subject to basic screening at the admission. For those who have a low risk of recidivism, no further assessment is needed, while offenders with a medium to high risk of recidivism should be subjected to further assessment in order to make individual decisions regarding program, level of control and treatment (Christensen, Jannetta, & Buck-Willison, 2012).

(Re)classification is performed for a different purpose in relation to the assessment of the recidivism risk, the first one includes the period from admission to the correctional institution and imprisonment, through serving the sentence and release, and the other to the post-release control in the community. The evaluation is closely related to the corrective classification in that the convict's score on a risk assessment instrument usually serves as an important basis when deciding on their classification and reclassification (Andrews & Bonta, 2003).

Although many factors are considered in the classification process (e.g., abuse of psychoactive substances and/or alcohol, earlier criminal history, the length of sentence and remaining time of serving the sentence, the gravity of the crime) as well as in the reclassification process, they have little ability to predict the risk of recidivism and they are primarily taken into account in the process of assessing the control level (Andrews

[2] Article 7 of The Rulebook on classification and reclassification of convicts (2011).

& Bonta, 2003; Austin, 2003). Given the continuous need for control and reduction of the prison population, the aim of this research was to gain insight into the nature of the relationship between criminal behavioral styles and criminal thinking styles and the results of monitoring the activities of convicted persons in the process of re-classification; thinking and behaviour, in order to identify and eliminate 8 styles of thinking and 4 styles of behaviour that characterize the criminal lifestyle. If these additional factors (risk factors) are identified and confirmed, the efficiency of the existing re-classification system can be improved.

3 Method

3.1 Subjects

The subjects in this research were 126 prisoners of the Banja Luka Correctional Facility (The Republic of Srpska, Bosnia and Herzegovina). The average age of respondents serving the prison sentence is 38.83 years (SD = 12.13), and most of the respondents have completed secondary school (62.3%), while 22.6% of respondents completed primary education. The part of other categories in the sample (without education, college and faculty) is negligible. When talking about marital status, 33% of respondents are married, while 22.6% are in common law marriage, and 20.8% of the respondents are unmarried. Other categories in the sample (divorced, not married, widower) is negligible.

Convicts who were subjects in this research have stated reasons for being in prison as the commission of the criminal offenses in the following areas: crimes against life and limb; criminal offences against sexual freedom; criminal offences against marriage and family; criminal offences against public health; criminal offences against property; criminal offences against the economy and the payment system; criminal offences against official duties; criminal offences against public peace and order; criminal offences against the public safety of persons and property; criminal offences against environment; criminal offences against the economy, market integrity and in the area of customs; crimes against humanity and values protected by international law; conspiracy, preparation, associating; and organised crime (Criminal Code of Bosnia and Herzegovina, 2015; Criminal Code of Republic of Srpska, 2013).

Of the total sample of criminal offenders, 40 respondents (31.75%) committed criminal offences with elements of violence, 62 respondents (49.21%) committed criminal offences without elements of violence, while 24 respondents (19.05%) committed criminal offences belonging in both categories. It should also be noted that 21 respondents (16.67%) are serving a prison sentence for up to one year, 57 respondents (45.24%) of one to five years, twenty-five respondents (19.84%) from five to ten years, while sixteen respondents (12.70%) are serving a prison sentence of 10 to 15 years. One respondent (0.79%) is serving a prison sentence of 15 to 20 years, while six respondents (4.76%) did not provide the information regarding the duration of the sentence. There are 56 (44.44%) recidivists in the sample, and of these, 28 (22.22%) were previously punished for criminal offences against property.

3.2 Instrumentation

The depth of involvement in criminal lifestyles was measured with the updated version of the Lifestyle Criminality Screening Form (Walters et al., 1991), which, besides the 14 original items, was supplemented with four items and in theory it measures four behavioral styles typical for criminal lifestyle: irresponsibility (5 items), self-indulgence (4 items), interpersonal intrusiveness (5 items) and social rule breaking (3 items). After the metric characteristics of the questionnaire were analysed, Buđanovac and Jandrić (2007) proposed the update of the instrument reliability and added further four items to the questionnaire. The items are scored by 0–1 and 0–2 system and the result provides for total at each subscale.

A description of the four scales can be seen in Table1. Keeping in mind that the LCSF consists of a subscale with a relatively small number of items, internal consistency was verified by calculating mean inter-item correlations. In our study, the value of MIC for the irresponsibility subscale is R = 0.14, for self-indulgence R = 0.21, for interpersonal intrusiveness R = 0.24, and for social rule breaking R = 0.52. All mean inter-item correlations fall in the recommended range of 0.15–0.50 (see Briggs & Cheek in Clark & Watson, 1995) except for mean inter-item correlation for the subscale irresponsibility which is something lower.

The variable of criminal thinking style was measured with the Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles (PICTS) (Walters, 1995, 2005). This instrument has a total of 80 items in two scales of validation confusion (CF) and defensiveness (DF) which were developed in order to detect nonveridical response, and eight scales representing the criminal thinking styles mollification (MO), cut-off CO), entitlement (EN), power orientation (PO), sentimentality (SN), superoptimism (SO), cognitive indolence (CI), and discontinuity (DS).

Each subscale consists of 8 items in a 4-level Likert format. A description of the eight thinking scales and two validity scales can be seen in Table 1. Internal consistency for the PICTS was also verified by calculating mean inter-item correlations. In our study, the value of MIC for confusion is R =

0.18, for defensiveness R = 0.23, for mollification R = 0.31, for cut-off R = 0.45, for entitlement R = 0.18, for power orientation R = 0.40, for sentimentality R = 0.39, for superoptimism R = 0.35, for cognitive indolence R = 0.36, and for discontinuity R = 0.44. All mean inter-item correlations fall in the recommended range of 0.15–0.50 (see Briggs & Cheek in Clark & Watson, 1995).

The results of monitoring the activities of convicted persons are expressed in numerical grades from 1 to 5 for each activity that is subject to monitoring.[3] Reclassification of convicted persons is carried out on the basis of continuous monitoring of the activities of convicted persons, which takes place in all segments of life and work in a correctional facility, whereby the following elements are especially taken into: a) the assessment of the influence of rehabilitation on changing attitudes, habits and other orientations of the convicted person - information, opinions and assessments are drawn up by the group rehabilitator, b) the assessment of conduct in the prison environment, which includes attitudes toward prison officials and other convicts, attitudes toward property, personal and collective hygiene, respect for time organization; information, opinions and assessments are drawn up by the internal security commander, c) the assessment of the results of work, work discipline, initiative, regards for work resources, the use of the protection at work, innovations – information, opinions and assessments are drawn up by the work instructor, d) the assessment of the engagement in cultural, educational, sports and other leisure activities – information, opinions and assessments are drawn up by the cultural and educational rehabilitator, e) information on disciplinary violations – information is prepared by the group rehabilitator.[4]

The authors operationalized the variable that represents the thinking segment in reclassification as an assessment of the influence of rehabilitation on changing attitudes, believes, habits and other orientations of the convicts (under "a"), and the variable that represents the behaviour segment in reclassification as an average assessment of the following four segments that are related to the behaviour of the convicts in the mentioned aspects (under "b, c, d, and e").

3.3 Procedure

The survey was carried out at the correctional facility in Banja Luka in November 2017 on 126 respondents, and prior to conducting the on-site research, we requested and were granted consent by the Ministry of Justice. It should be noted that the correctional facility currently has 147 male inmates and that a certain number of them were not able to participate in the research. Namely, some of the respondents were excluded from the research because they have been imposed a measure of solitary as a result violating discipline, then mentally ill individuals who have significantly reduced mental capacity, those participating in work of common interest for the life and work of the convicted persons (on pig farms), illiterate, foreigners, those who are on leave, and those who did not want to participate in the research. The research at the facility was conducted by the authors with the help of rehabilitators. Since the authors did not have insight into the information on the success of rehabilitation of prisoners in accordance with ethical principles, the rehabilitators handed to each individual convict (from the list of all convicted persons) a specific number of questionnaires that they completed. After that, each individual prisoner (or its corresponding number) was assigned a score in thinking and behaviour segments. Respondents filled out the questionnaires in the dining facility and were provided with basic information on what is being researched, and it was emphasized that it was anonymous and that the results will be used exclusively for research purposes.

4 Results

In order to gain insight into the nature of correlation between 8 criminal thinking styles and 4 criminal behavioral styles on one hand, and the results of monitoring the activities of convicted persons (separately in segments of thinking and behavior) on the other, two zero-order correlations have been calculated. Descriptive statistics and correlations for the Criminal Thinking Styles (PICTS) and Criminal Life Style (LCSF) and the result of monitoring the activities of convicted persons in the thinking and behavioral segment are listed in Table 2.

Seven out of eight criminal styles of thinking negatively correlate with the result of monitoring the activities of convicted persons in the thinking segment, and three out of four criminal behavioral styles negatively correlate with the result of monitoring the activities of convicted persons in the behavioral segment.

[3] See Article 9 of The Rulebook on classification and reclassification of convicts (2011).

[4] See Article 8 of The Rulebook on classification and reclassification of convicts (2011).

Table 1: Descriptions of the PICTS and LCSF scales

Scale	Description [b]	Scale	Description [c]
Confusion [a]	Psychological distress, mental confusion, poor reading skills, or deliberate attempt to portray oneself as having psychological disturbance.	Irresponsibility	Global sence of irresponsibility in all aspects of one's behaviour- neglecting social, moral and legal obligations to others and acts as if one is accountable to no one but himself.
Defensiveness [a]	Defensive test-taking style in which the respondent is attempting to present oneself as free of minor difficulties, deficiencies and foibles.	Self-indulgence	Lack of one's self-restraint and continual search for pleasure despite the negative long-term consequences of one's action.
Mollification	Justification, rationalization of criminal behavior; focus on external factors.	Interpersonal intrusiveness	Callously ancroaching on the rights, feelings and private lives of one's victims with little regard for the destructiveness of one's behavior.
Cut-off	Elimination of deterrents (e.g., fear, anxiety, disgust) to criminal behaviour.	Social rule breaking	Reveals a blatant disregard for the laws and norms of society.
Entitlement	Perception of oneself as privileged or special.		
Power orientation	Focus on power and control over others.		
Sentimentality	Deny or minimize harm by performing good deeds to appear kind and generous.		
Superoptimism	Over-confidence in ability to avoid negative consequences.		
Cognitive indolence	Putting little effort into problem-solving or critical evaluation of thought.		
Discontinuity	Being easily distracted; trouble following through on good intentions.		

[a] Validity scale; [b] Walters, 1995; Walters et al., 1991.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics and Correlations between the Criminal thinking styles (PICTS) and Criminal life style (LCSF) and the result of monitoring the activities of convicted persons in the thinking and behavioral segment

	thinking segment	range	M(SD)	r		behavioral segment	range	M(SD)	r
PICTS	Confusion	11-24	16.80(2.80)	-.07	LCSF	irresponsibility	0-7	2.35(1.72)	-.16
	Defensiveness	11-26	17.96(3.07)	-.07		self-indulgence	0-5	1.37(1.36)	-.30**
	Mollification	8-26	14.87(4.48)	-.27**		interpersonal intrusiveness	0-7	1.77(1.89)	-.21*
	Cutoff	8-26	12.52(4.52)	-.33**		social rule breaking	0-6	1.63(1.64)	-.31**
	Entitlement	8-26	14.25(4.32)	-.33**		LCSF	0-22	2	-.33**
	power orientation	8-23	13.22(3.87)	-.26**					
	Sentimentality	8-32	17.08(5.21)	-.19					
	Superoptimism	8-27	13.76(4.38)	-.31**					
	cognitive indolence	8-28	14.69(4.49)	-.29**					
	Discontinuity	8-26	13.41(4.63)	-.22*					
	PICTS GCT	101-236	148.55(30.08)	-.34**					

** $p < 0.01$.

In this way, we analyzed the strength and direction of correlations among the variables, but we did not a cause-and-effect relationship. Contribution of two sets of predictors (8 criminal thinking styles and 4 criminal behavioral styles) in explaining the variance of two criterion variables; the result of monitoring the activity of the convicted persons in the thinking segment and the result of monitoring the activities of the convicted persons in the behavioral segment, controlling the influence of other variables (years of life, marital status, degree of education, duration of sentence, type of criminal offense, recidivism) was verified by two multiple hierarchical regression analysis. Preliminary analyses indicated that the assumptions about the adequacy of distribution, linearity, multicollinearity, and variance homogeneity were not distorted. The results of two hierarchical multiple regression analysis are presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Summary of two HMRA for Variables Total LCSF score and PICTS GCT predicting the result of monitoring the activities of convicted persons in the behavioral and thinking segment

Variable	B	SE B	ß	Variable	B	SE B	ß
Step 1				Step1			
Age	.01	.01	.06	Age	-.01	.01	-.02
Marital status	-.06	.05	-.13	Marital status	-.03	.06	-.05
Level of education	.10	.08	.12	Level of education	.24	.10	.26*
Length of sentence	.15	.06	.27*	Length of sentence	.16	.07	.26*
Recidivism	-.03	10	-.03	Recidivism	-.01	.12	-.01
Step 2				Step 2			
Age	.01	.01	.02	Age	-.01	.01	-.02
Marital status	-.05	.05	-.11	Marital status	-.01	.06	-.01
Education level	.05	.08	.06	Level of education	.19	.09	.20*
Sentence length	.13	.06	.24*	Length of sentence	.15	.07	.25*
Recidivism	-.03	.10	-.03	Recidivism	-.08	.12	-.07
Total LCSF	-.03	.01	-.24*	PICTS GCT	-.01	.01	-.26**

Note: HMRA = hierarchical multiple regression analysis; PICTS GCT = General Criminal Thinking (GCT) score of the Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles; Total LCSF score = Total Lifestyle Criminality Screening Form score; HMRA 1 - $R^2 = 0.13$ for Step 1; $R^2 = 0.18$ for Step 2; $\Delta R^2 = 0.05$ (*p < 0.05); HMRA 2 - $R^2 = 0.14$ for Step 1; $R^2 = 0.20$ for Step 2; $\Delta R^2 = 0.06$ (*p < 0.05; ** p < 0.01).

After statistical depreciation of the influence of control variables (age, marital status, education level, sentence length and recidivism), the significance of predictive variables was established in both regression models. The Total LCSF Score as a static variable can successfully predict the result of monitoring the activity of convicted persons in the behavioral segment, as it explains the additional 5% (ΔF (6,119) = 5.70, p <.05) of the variance of the criterion variable, while General Criminal Thinking (GCT) score of the Psychic Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles (PICTS) as a dynamic variable can successfully predict the result of monitoring the activity of convicted persons in thinking segment, as it explains an additional 6% (ΔF (6,119) = 7.04, p < 0. 01) of the variance of the criterion variables (see Table 3).

In the first regression model, only two predictors showed significant partial correlations with the criterion variable, with the control variable, the sentence length, having the same coefficient ß (ß = .24, t = 2.28, p < 0.05) as the interest variable Total LCSF score ß = –0.24, t = –2.39, p < 0.05). In the second regression model, three predictors showed significant partial correlations with the criterion variable, with the interest variable General Criminal Thinking (GCT) score of the Psychic Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles (PICTS) having the highest coefficient ß (ß = –0.26, t = –2.65, p < 0.01) unlike control variables, the education level (ß = 0.20, t = 2.03, p < 0.05), and sentence length (ß = 0.25, t = 2.34, p < 0.05), (see Table 3).

5 Discussion

Contemporary penology requires effective classification of offenders into categories according to the level of risk and treatment needs (Andrews & Bonta, 1994). A classification system helps minimize the potential for prison violence, escape, and institutional misconduct, and proper classification is crucial to the efficient and safe operation of any prison facility. Offenders are diverse and possess a variety of behavioral and treatment needs, as well as varying states of psychological health.

To date, according to our knowledge, PICTS and LCSF have not been considered in the context of the classification of convicts. In this exploratory research on a sample of convicts in the Banja Luka Correctional Facility with the purpose to improve internal (re)classification, we have attempted to gain insight into the nature of the correlation between criminal behavioral styles and criminal thinking styles on one hand, and the results of monitoring the activities of convicted persons in the process of re-classification, i.e., the segment of thinking and behavior on the other. According to Walters' categorization (Walters, 2002), based on the average LCSF score (see table 2), we conclude that the respondents fall into moderate category of involvement in the criminal lifestyle (M = 7.12, SD = 4.80).

The results indicate that seven out of eight criminal styles of thinking (mollification, cut-off, entitlement, power orientation, superoptimism, cognitive indolence, and discontinuity) are, from the statistical point of view, significantly negatively correlated with the result of monitoring the activity of convicted persons in thinking segments. Three out of four criminal behavioural styles (interpersonal intrusiveness, self-indulgence and social rule breaking) are, from the statistical point of view, significantly negatively correlated with the result of monitoring the activity of convicted persons in the behavioral segment. The criminal behavioral style of irresponsibility and the criminal thinking style of sentimentality were not identified in this sample, so no statistically significant correlations were obtained with respect to the criterion variables. This result can be attributed to the lower mean inter-item correlation of irresponsibility subscale (R = 0.14) and a rather small sample. Thus, convicts deeply involved in criminal lifestyles and those who have more developed criminal thinking styles have lower scores regarding the influence of rehabilitation on changing thinking and behavior.

According to Walters (2006a), the model of lifestyle change theory consists of four elements. The first element is responsibility, the main element of which is the will of the person to accept the consequences of his actions. Such responsibility is characterized more by internal attributes than guilt, by decisiveness rather than suspicion, and by taking responsibility rather than finding excuses. The second element is self-confidence as an essential element of self-change. In this regard, self-efficacy is emphasized as a specific type of self-confidence, which is defined as the ability to handle high-risk situations. It is the third element that affects the change of the perception of itself and the world around it, and can lead to spontaneous rejection of the lifestyle. The change in this element can occur through learning a complex way of thinking and rejection of labelling. The final element is a community that offers the element of social support, interpersonal reciprocity, and the ability to overcome the current situation and perceive connectivity with the world. According to lifestyle theory (Walters, 2010: 991), the criminal offender will not change unless there is a reason to do so largely because the criminal lifestyle is simply too rewarding and previous correctional efforts have only served to minimize accountability, remove personal responsibility, and, to some degree, reinforce an offender's "way of life".

The results of two multiple hierarchical regression analyses indicate that the PICTS and LCSF questionnaires (having control over the variables such as age, marital status, education level, sentence length, recidivism) can be successful predictors of monitoring the activity of the convicted person (thinking and behaviour segments) in the process of (re)classifications in the penitentiary system of the Republic of Srpska since low but statistically significant (6% and 5%) explain a part of the variance of these two criterion variables. Given the small amount of explained variance, further research is needed and additional factors need to be included that may contribute to the explanation of the criterion variable; the results of monitoring the activities of the convicted persons in the re-classification process.

The external validity of these results is limited by the fact that the participants were adult male prisoners from only one correctional institution (Banja Luka Correctional Facility, in the Republic of Srpska, Bosnia and Herzegovina). It is therefore uncertain how well these results generalize to female inmates, juvenile detainees or even adult male prisoners from other prisons. Quite obviously, additional research is required to determine the applicability of these results to other samples and populations. Given that this is an exploratory research, the results should be considered as preliminary.

6 Conclusion

Inmate classification is an important process that has a tremendous impact on the nature, quality and ease of an individual's incarceration (Proctor, 1994). Psychological measures provide one source of objective information that can be implemented in correctional classification. As mentioned earlier, the assessment is closely related to the corrective classification in the sense that the score of the convict on the risk assessment instrument usually serves as an important basis when deciding on their classification and reclassification (Andrews & Bonta, 2003). Based on the results of our research, it has been shown that PICTS and LCSF questionnaires, apart from assessing institutional misconduct, criminal recidivism, and violence, can also serve in the (re)classification of convicts. This finding is of course very important, not only from a theoretical point of

view, but also from the practical one. Our study was limited, however, by the fact that cross-sectional data were used. The idea for future researchers would be to investigate how long the prisoners are willing to work on changing attitudes, opinions and behavior, or to what degree the goals of treatment for reintegration into the community can be achieved. Similar uses of the PICTS have been recognized by Walters along with his associates. In an earlier study, the PICTS (Walters, Trgovac, Rychlec, Di Fazio, & Olson, 2002) showed significant reductions in prisoners exposed to several different forms of behavioral and psychoeducational intervention. In another study, the PICTS declined significantly following a 10-week program of psychoeducation designed to educate clients about the criminal and drug lifestyles, and to provide them with skills in promoting change (Walters, 2003a).

Considering that the sample in our research is too small for additional goals, future research could determine whether the average results of monitoring the activity of convicted persons in the process of re-classification; segment of thinking and behavior differ depending on the type of criminal offense for which they are serving the prison sentences. Based on these results, treatment programs could be created. Therefore, the value of the above-mentioned research results with the PICTS and LCSF questionnaires should not be limited to research purposes alone but they may also have their clinical purpose as a diagnostic instrument for treatment. One implication of the current results is that the dynamic risk factors such as criminal thinking and criminal behaviour, have the potential to improve inmate classification. Today, it is well known that the most effective treatments in penological rehabilitation rely on mostly cognitive or cognitive/behavioral approachs, and the theory of lifestyle is one of the theories that are based on such an approach. Given that the theory has precisely defined and structured concepts accompanied by appropriate instrumentation, and thus can be verified, the results can be used to identify individual criminal behavioral styles and the criminal styles of thinking on which treatment should focus, and that can also as a measure of progress in treatment (Walters, 2017). Compared to static variables (age, sex, criminal history), dynamic variables include predictors that can be adjusted (Bonta, 1999; Gendreau, Little, & Goggin, 1996). These factors of antisocial behavior are related to environmental factors, drug abuse, antisocial (criminal) attitudes/beliefs and weak social skills. Given that dynamic factors are subject to change, they represent significant targets in relation to risk management strategies and are often used when assessing changes (Bonta, 1999).

Given the fact that this is an exploratory study, further research is needed to verify a model that offers the theory of criminal lifestyle in a new context in order to use the results in diagnosing and creating a treatment program in the penal system of the Republic of Srpska. In this way, two key questions will be answered: 1) What level of security and programs should the prisoner be exposed to while incarcerated?; and, 2) When should the prisoner be released and under what forms of supervision and services?

References

1. Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. L. (1994). *The psyhology of criminal conduct*. Cincinnati: Anderson.
2. Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. L. (2003). *The psychology of criminal conduct* (3rd ed.). Cincinnati: Anderson.
3. Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. L (2010). Rehabilitating criminal justice policy and practice. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 16*(1), 39–55.
4. Austin, J. (2003). *Findings in prison classification and risk assessment*. Alexandria: National Institute of Corrections.
5. Baird, C. (2009). *A question of evidence: A critique of risk assessment models used in the justice system*. Madison: National Council on Crime and Delinquency.
6. Bonta, J. (1999). Approaches to offender risk assessment: Static vs. dynamic. *Research Summary* (Vol. 4). Ottawa: Corrections Research and Development.
7. Buđanovac, A., & Jandrić, A. (2007). Evaluation of lifestyle criminality screening form in Croatian prison system. *Croatian Review of Rehabilitation Research, 43*(2), 17–27.
8. Christensen, G., Jannetta, J., & Buck-Willison, J. (2012). *The role of screening and assessment in jail reentry.* Washington: The Urban Institute.
9. Clark, L. A., & Watson, D. (1995). Constructing validity: Basic issues in objective scale development. *Psychological Assessment, 7*(3), 309–319.
10. Criminal Code of Bosnia and Herzegovina. (2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2010, 2014, 2015). *Official Gazette of BiH,* (3/03, 32/03, 37/03 54/04, 61/04, 30/05, 53/06, 55/06, 32/07, 8/10, 47/14, 22/15, 40/15).
11. Criminal Code of Republic of Srpska. (2003, 2004, 2006, 2010, 2012, 2013). *Official Gazette of the Republic of Srpska,* (49/03, 108/04, 37/06, 70/06, 73/10, 1/12, 67/13).
12. Doležal (2007). Factor analysis of the question-form the psychological inventory of criminal thinking styles. *Croatian Review of Rehabilitation Research 43*(1), 13–29.
13. Doležal, D. (2009). Differences between involvement in criminal lifestyle among prisoners considering age, recidivism and violent behaviour. *Criminology and Social Integration, 17*(2), 35–47.
14. Doležal, D., & Mikšaj-Todorović, L. (2008). Relation between the psychological inventory of criminal thinking styles and level of service inventory revised. *Criminology and Social Integration 16*(1), 25–32.
15. Gendreau, P., Little, T., & Goggin, C. (1996). A meta-analysis of the predictors of adult offender recidivism. *Criminology, 34*(4), 575–607.
16. Hamilton, Z., Neuilly, M. A., Lee, S., & Barnoski, S. (2014). Isolating modeling effects in offender risk assessment. *Journal of Experimental Criminology, 11*(2), 299–318.
17. Hollin, C. R., Palmer, E. J., & Hatcher R. M. (2013). Efficacy of correctional cognitive skills programmes. In L. A. Craig, T. A.

Gannon, & L. Dixon, (eds.), *What works in offender rehabilitation: An evidence-based approach to assessment and treatment* (pp. 117–128). Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell.

18. Jandrić Nišević, A. (2009). *Criminal thinking styles* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Zagreb: Faculty of Education and Rehabilitation Sciences, University of Zagreb.
19. Jandrić Nišević, A. (2010). Differences in criminal thinking styles considering the involvement in criminal lifestyle. *Croatian Review of Rehabilitation Research, 46*(1), 1–12.
20. Latessa, E. J., & Lovins, B. (2010). The role of offender risk assessment: A policy maker guide. *Victims & Offenders, 5*(3), 203–219.
21. Lauren, R. J. (1997). *Positive approaches to corrections: Research, policy and practice*. Alexandria: American Correctional Association.
22. Lowenkamp, C. T., & Latessa, E. J. (2004). *Understanding the risk principle: How and why correctional interventions can harm low-risk offenders*. Retrieved from https://www.correctiveservices.justice.nsw.gov.au/Documents/Risk-principal--accessible-442577.pdf
23. Proctor, J. L. (1994). Evaluating a modified version of the federal prison system's inmate classification model: An assessment of objectivity and predictive validity. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 21*(2), 256–272.
24. Sarver, C. M., Prince, K. C. Seawright, J., & Butters, R. P. (2015). *A review of brief risk assessment tools validated for use in correctional settings*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah.
25. Schmalleger, F., & Smykla, J. O. (2001). *Corrections in the 21st century*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
26. The Rulebook on classification and reclassification of convicts. (2011). *Official Gazette of the Republic of Srpska*, (36/11).
27. Walters, G. D. (1990). *The criminal lifestyle: Patterns of serious criminal conduct*. London, New Delhi: Sage Publications.
28. Walters, G. D. (1991). Predicting the disciplinary adjustment of maximum security prison inmates using the lifestyle criminality screening form. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 35*(1), 63–71.
29. Walters, G. D. (1995). The Psychological inventory of criminal thinking styles: Part I: Reliability and preliminary validity. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 22*(3), 307–325.
30. Walters, G. D. (1996). The psychological inventory of criminal thinking styles: Part III. Predictive validity. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 40*(2), 105–112.
31. Walters, G. D. (1997). Predicting short-term release outcome using the LCSF and PICTS. *Journal of the Mental Health in Corrections Consortium, 43*(3&4), 18–25.
32. Walters, G. D. (1998a). *Changing lives of crime and drugs: Intervening with substance-abusing offenders*. New York: Wiley and Sons.
33. Walters, G. D. (1998b). *The addiction concept: Working hypothesis or self-fulfilling prophesy?* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
34. Walters, G. D. (2002). *Criminal belief systems: An Integrated-interactive Theory of lifestyles*. Westport: Praeger.
35. Walters, G. D. (2003a). Changes in outcome expectancies and criminal thinking following a brief course of psychoeducation. *Personality and Individual Differences, 35*(3), 691–701.
36. Walters G. D. (2003b). Predicting criminal justice outcomes with the Psychopathy checklist and Lifestyle criminality screening form: A meta-analytic comparison. *Behavioral Sciences & Law, 21*(1), 89–102.
37. Walters, G. D. (2005). Predicting institutional adjustment with the Lifestyle criminality screening form: Preliminary data. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 18*(4), 406–418.
38. Walters, G. D. (2006a). *Lifestyle theory – Past, present and future*. New York: Nova Science Publishers.
39. Walters, G. D. (2006b). Risk-appraisal versus self-report in the prediction of criminal justice outcomes. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 33*(3), 179–304.
40. Walters, G. D. (2006c). Use of the psychological inventory of criminal thinking styles to predict disciplinary adjustment in male inmate program participants. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 50*(2), 166–173.
41. Walters, G. D. (2010). Lifestyle theory. In F. T. Cullen, & P. Wilcox (eds.), *Encyclopedia of criminological theory* (Vol.2) (pp. 989–991). Los Angeles: Sage Publications.
42. Walters, G. D. (2011). Predicting recidivism with the psychological inventory of criminal thinking styles and level of service inventory-revised: Screening version. *Law and Human Behavior, 35*(3), 211–220.
43. Walters, G. D. (2017). Risk, need and responsivity in a criminal lifestyle. In F. S. Taxman (ed.), *Handbook on risk and need assessment: Theory and practice* (pp. 193–199). New York, London: Taylor & Francis.
44. Walters G. D., & Chlumsky M. L. (1993). The lifestyle criminality screening form and antisocial personality disorder: Predicting release outcome in a state prison sample. *Behavioral Sciences & Law, 11(1), 111–115.*
45. Walters, G. D., & Di Fazio, R. (2001). *Changes in the PICTS scales following participation in various psychological programs*. Unpublished raw data.
46. Walters, S. T., Clark, M. D., Gingerich, R., & Meltzer, M. L. (2007). *Motivating offenders to change: A guide for probation and parole*. Washington: National Institute of Corrections.
47. Walters, G. D., Revella, L., & Baltrusaitis, W. J. (1990). Predicting parole/probation outcome with the aid lifestyle criminality screening form. *Psychological Assessment, 2*(3), 313–316.
48. Walters, G. D., Trgovac, M., Rychlec, M., Di Fazio, R., & Olson, J. R. (2002). Assessing change with the Psychological inventory of criminal thinking styles: A controlled analysis and multisite cross-validation. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 29*(3), 308–331.
49. Walters, G. D., White, T. W., & Denney, D. (1991). The lifestyle criminality screening form: Preliminary data. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 18*(4), 406–418.
50. Yochelson, S., & Samenow, S. (1976). *The criminal personality: A profile for change* (Vol.1). New York: A Jason Aronson.
51. Yochelson, S., & Samenow, S. (1977). *The criminal personality: A profile for change* (Vol. 2). New York: A Jason Aronson.

Revija za kriminalistiko in kriminologijo / Ljubljana 70 / 2019 / 4, 323–334

Kriminalni življenjski slog in slog kriminalnega razmišljanja kot prediktorja rezultatov spremljanja dejavnosti obsojencev v procesu (re)klasifikacije

Dr. Žana Vrućinić, docentka, Fakulteta za varnostne vede, Univerza v Banjaluki, Republika Srbska.
E-pošta: zana.vrucinic@fbn.unibl.org

Namen raziskave je bil pridobiti vpogled v naravo korelacij med kriminalnimi vedenjskimi slogi in slogi kriminalnega razmišljanja ter rezultatov spremljanja dejavnosti obsojencev v postopku (re)klasifikacije. Kriminalni vedenjski slogi so bili merjeni z Lifestyle Criminality Screening Form Score (LCSF) (Walters, White, & Denney, 1991), slogi kriminalnega razmišljanja pa s Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles (PICTS) (Walters, 1995, 2005). Namen merjenja je bila identifikacija osmih različnih slogov mišljenja in štirih slogov vedenja, značilnega za kriminalni življenjski slog. V vzorec je bilo vključenih 126 obsojencev iz Kazensko-prevzgojnega zavoda Banjaluka. Sedem od osmih slogov kriminalnega razmišljanja (utemeljitev, rezanje, dovoljenje, usmerjenost k moči, superoptimizem, kognitivna lenoba in diskontinuiteta) negativno korelira z rezultati spremljanja dejavnosti obsojencev v segmentu *mišljenja*. Trije od štirih kriminalnih vedenjskih slogov (samozadovoljstvo, medosebna agresivnost in kršenje socialnih pravil) so v negativni korelaciji z rezultati spremljanja dejavnosti obsojencev v segmentu *obnašanja*. Ugotovitve so pokazale, da splošni rezultat na vprašalniku Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles (PICTS) in splošni rezultat na vprašalniku Lifestyle Criminality Screening Form Score (LCSF) uspešno napovesta rezultate spremljanja dejavnosti na vzorcu 216 obsojencev moškega spola v odnosu na segmenta vedenja in mišljenja v procesu (re)klasifikacije, v povezavi s spremenljivkami: starost, zakonski stan, stopnja izobrazbe, dolžina kazni in povratništvo. Rezultati kažejo, da se splošna rezultata na vprašalnikih PICTS in LCSF lahko uporabljata pri odločanju v zvezi z notranjo (re)klasifikacijo. V zaključku razpravljamo o teoretičnih in praktičnih posledicah rezultatov.

Ključne besede: kriminalni življenjski slogi, slogi kriminalnega razmišljanja, prestopniki, klasifikacija zaporov

UDK: 343.9