

A FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF YOUNG OFFENDERS
RELEASED FROM A YOUTH CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION

BY

NANCY F. BARKWELL

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL WORK
UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA
WINNIPEG, MANITOBA

(C) MAY 1993

**A FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF YOUNG OFFENDERS
RELEASED FROM A YOUTH CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION**

BY

NANCY F. BARKWELL

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK

© 1993

Permission has been granted to the LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA to lend or sell copies of this thesis, to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film, and UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS to publish an abstract of this thesis.

The author reserves other publications rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	i
------------------	---

ABSTRACT	ii
----------	----

	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. LITERATURE REVIEW	11
III. METHODS	28
IV. RESULTS	38
V. DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	66

BIBLIOGRAPHY	93
--------------	----

APPENDIX	98
----------	----

LIST OF TABLES

	PAGE
1. AGE	39
2. ETHNIC ORIGIN	40 ...
3. EDUCATION LEVEL	41
4. LENGTH OF TIME IN SECURE CUSTODY	42
5. COMMITTED OFFENCE(S)	44
6. PRIOR OFFENCE(S)	45
7. DISPOSITIONS OF PRIOR OFFENCE(S)	46
8. LIVING SITUATION WHEN RELEASED	47
9. PRESENT LIVING SITUATION	48
10. SCHOOL/TRAINING PROGRAM ATTENDED	49
11. REINVOLVEMENT WITH THE LAW	54
12. CHILD ABUSE DISCLOSURE	74
13. CONTACT WITH NATURAL FATHER	76
14. PRIOR OFFENCE(S)	78
15. LENGTH OF TIME IN SECURE CUSTODY	80

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis presents descriptive findings of young offenders released from the Manitoba Youth Centre in 1991. It required the assistance and cooperation of many people and I wish here to express my appreciation.

None of the research reported on here would have been possible without the willing participation of twenty-eight young people who entrusted me with their experiences, thoughts and perceptions. In addition, their parents provided me with their consent for which I am grateful.

I was fortunate in receiving advice and support from a committee composed of Denis Bracken, Don Fuchs and Rick Linden. A special thanks to Denis for being available for numerous consultations.

Merlyn Rotter meticulously and patiently typed this thesis. Her assistance and interest was extremely valuable.

Other individuals who were helpful in the study are the correctional staff within Community and Youth Corrections and Adult Corrections (Department of Justice).

My deepest gratitude goes to my parents, Mary and Ted, who gave me strength and support to complete the study.

Finally, I would like to express my appreciation to other family members and friends, too numerous to mention, who showed interest in my work and provided me with their support.

ABSTRACT

This thesis presents a follow-up study of young offenders released from secure custody at the Manitoba Youth Centre. It attempted to investigate three questions: What are young offenders' experiences within the community following their release from secure custody?, How do young offenders view their program experiences at the Manitoba Youth centre? and What are the young offenders' perceptions regarding the benefits of their program experiences towards community adjustment? Twenty-eight youths who had been in secure custody for at least three months and discharged to an address in Winnipeg were interviewed. The study based on a qualitative research model describes the experiences, thoughts and perceptions of these young offenders.

The results found that the young offenders' experiences within the community were less than ideal. Most of them lived in several different places, were in school or work for short periods of time and were reinvolved with the law. They viewed their program experiences at the Centre as favourable. Yet, the young offenders felt that they did not benefit in the community from these program experiences.

The conclusion is that the Manitoba Youth Centre needs to consider factors that have been demonstrated to help young offenders adjust in the community. The recommendations start with the development of theories and the incorporation of intervention strategies. Relapse Prevention is proposed as it takes into consideration many of the youths' comments and suggestions.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Chapter I will introduce the purpose of the follow-up study, describe the Manitoba Youth Centre and present the use and limitations of the study.

1. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of the follow-up study was to follow-up young offenders released from secure custody at the Manitoba Youth Centre (M.Y.C.). This involved selecting a sample of former residents (released from M.Y.C. in 1991), attempting to locate each one and completing an interview with them. Based on their self reports and perceptions from the interviews, information and feedback data were obtained with regards to their adjustment in the community and their views of their program experiences within the Manitoba Youth Centre. To this writer's knowledge no previous attempt has been made to officially pursue former residents from the Manitoba Youth Centre. The study originated in comments expressed by Manitoba Youth Centre and Community and Youth Corrections personnel. Their comments included guesses, questions and interests about former residents' community experiences following a period of secure custody. Therefore, through the study one will learn about former residents' community experiences and their Manitoba Youth Centre program experiences.

The follow-up study attempted to investigate the following three questions:

- 1) What are young offenders' experiences within the community following their release from secure custody?
- 2) How do young offenders view their program experiences at the Manitoba Youth Centre?
- 3) What are the young offenders' perceptions regarding the benefits of their program experiences toward their community adjustment?

2. MANITOBA YOUTH CENTRE

The Manitoba Youth Centre is a youth correctional institution in Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada that has been in operation since April, 1973. It is a facility for youths ages 12 to 17 years charged with an offence or sentenced to custody under The Young Offenders Act.

The Manitoba Youth Centre can accommodate 150 young offenders and is subdivided into pre-trial detention, open and secure custody cottages. Pre-trial detention is where youths charged with an offence are held in custody until bail is granted or until the court deals with their charges. Custody is a judicial sentence

custody in 1991. Within secure custody, reintegration is approached through institution programs. When a young offender is sentenced to secure custody a case plan meeting occurs. Within the meeting a plan is developed based on the residents' needs. This plan identifies programs within the Centre to meet these needs. The residents are then expected to participate in these programs. Some of the programs that are available and the ones that the study will focus on are: Social Thinking Skills, Substance Abuse Intervention, Academic Education, Sexual Offender Program, Resident Employment Program, Religious Education Program and Recreation.

Social Thinking Skills, Substance abuse Intervention and the Academic Education classes are offered daily Monday to Friday from 9:00 A.M. to 11:15 A.M. and from 1:00 P.M to 2:45 P.M. Lunch and dinner are served at 11:30 A.M. and 4:30 P.M., respectively, in the cafeteria. In the evenings various programs are offered such as the Sexual Offender Program, Recreation and the Religious Education Program. In addition this is the time when visiting with relatives takes place. Recreation is also delivered on the weekends. Each of these programs plus the Resident Employment Program will be summarized below. This information was obtained directly from written descriptions at the Manitoba Youth Centre.

Social Thinking Skills and Substance Abuse Intervention are implemented by youth counsellors in one of the cottages classroom. Both of these programs may accommodate ten residents.

Social Thinking Skills is a twenty-five day (5 week) program. The purpose of Social Thinking Skills is to develop the participants' problem solving skills. It teaches problem solving steps and then practices the process through role plays and discussions on personal problems.

Substance Abuse Intervention is a twenty day (4 week) program. The purpose is for the participants to examine their substance and/or chemical abuse and learn alternatives.

The Sexual Offender Program is offered one evening per week and is implemented by youth counsellors in the group room of the institution. It can accommodate six to eight residents who have committed a sexual offence or who have disclosed a sexual offence. The resident will learn the effects of sexual assaults on victims and will develop a control plan.

The Resident Employment Program consists of jobs within four areas of the institution such as the Cafeteria, Recreation, Campus Grounds and Supplies and Food Truck. These jobs are performed at a variety of different times and places throughout the day and evening. They are all supervised by youth counsellors within each area. The purpose of the Resident Employment Program is to provide residents with the opportunity to experience a job. The participants will develop work habits and learn skills to perform within the work site.

The Religious Education Program is offered one evening per week and is implemented by a youth counsellor from the Chaplaincy Services Department and a group of community volunteers. It is offered to the entire institution and takes

place within the Cafeteria. The purpose of the Religious Education Program is for the residents to gain a better understanding of the Judeo-Christian heritage. They participate in activities such as bible study and discussions on Christian experiences in relation to issues like relationships, peer pressure, drugs and sexuality.

Recreation is offered for forty-five minutes every evening and is implemented by a youth counsellor within the Recreation Department. The whole cottage participates in the program as a group. The purpose of the Recreation Program is for the residents to develop some basic skills in activities such as basketball, volleyball, soccer and badminton and to establish a general fitness base. They experience team activities and group cohesiveness through those activities, as well as through the special events that are offered periodically, e.g., tournaments and festivals. The goal is for the residents to experience fun that will positively impact on their self image.

The Academic Education Program consists of teachers and an Education Coordinator. The Education Coordinator assesses the residents' education level and interests and assigns them to one of the Language Arts and Mathematics classes or to the Work Education Program. In addition, the students are assigned to the optional academic classes which are Lifestyles, Family Life, Adolescent Development, Communication Skills, and Life Skills. Students may receive high school half course credits for completing their course work. All classes take place in the cottages' classrooms.

Two classes of Mathematics are offered at the Manitoba Youth Centre. One class is to upgrade the students basic mathematical skills. The other provides instruction in mathematics at levels above grade six.

Two classes of Language Arts are offered. One class focuses on literacy and attempts to increase the reading and writing skills of students operating below grade six. The teacher within this class provides each student with an individualized program and incorporates community volunteers. The other class provides instruction in reading, writing and grammar.

The purpose of Lifestyles is to introduce the students to a variety of healthy lifestyles. These lifestyles are examined and experienced by the students.

The Family Life course focuses on the family. It discusses lifestyle practices that promote successful family living and healthy interpersonal relationships.

The purpose of the Adolescent Development course is for the students to develop an understanding of themselves in relation to society. The students explore and discuss elements of society that influence the adolescent culture such as social trends, morals, religion, and family.

The Communication Skills course examines the fundamental concepts of communication and how they affect the individual within society. The students explore concepts such as self-esteem, self-worth and self-concept and become aware of and comfortable with their own feelings.

The purpose of the Life Skills course is to assist the students to function in every day activities. The students are exposed to instruction in areas such as the

telephone book, transit system, map reading, shopping, basic budgeting and banking.

The purpose of the Work Education Program is to introduce youths to the world of work. The participants learn about the labour market and experience the steps to enter the world of work. Several options, such as community work experiences, community education and employment resources are available to the participants depending on their needs.

3. USE AND LIMITATION OF THE STUDY

The lack of information on how former residents adjusted in the community following their release from the Manitoba Youth Centre and their views of their program experiences in the Manitoba Youth Centre was the driving force behind the study. This study has attempted to provide a comprehensive picture of the youths' situation in the community including information regarding their living situation, education and employment involvement and reinvolverment with the law. Secondly, it has attempted to summarize the youths' views of their Manitoba Youth Centre program experiences through their review of each program they participated in and their reflections on programs that helped their community reintegration. It is hoped that the findings will provide useful information for the Manitoba Youth Centre in order to develop and maintain programs that assist young offenders reintegration into their community.

A major point that has to be made is that this follow-up study describes the circumstances and opinions of former residents at a point in time after they experienced programs in secure custody. As such, this is not an evaluation of the Manitoba Youth Centre's programs. To gain insight into the effectiveness of each program this study would have had to conduct an experiment and assign youths to "program" and "non-program" groups. Therefore, this study is not an attempt to provide data on the success or failure of programs at the Manitoba Youth Centre or the Manitoba Youth Centre itself. Simply its purpose is to describe a population and their views of their experiences after release.

There are some limitations to this type of study that are worth mentioning such as the accuracy of interview data. The young offenders that were interviewed were asked about programs they participated in nearly one year ago. Therefore, their recollection may not be accurate. Through prompting by the interviewer on program details such as the name of the facilitator or teacher or the location of the program or course the respondents were able to recall the programs they attended. Their information on each program and course was consistent amongst each others answers as well as consistent with the interviewers knowledge of the programs and courses. A second concern is honest responses. Some subjects may not have given honest responses due to concerns of confidentiality, embarrassment or a hesitancy to be critical of the Manitoba Youth Centre. The interview procedure tried to assure the subjects of confidentiality and reviewed the purpose of the study with them. In addition subjects were instructed to skip a question if they felt uncomfortable to

respond. There is no way of knowing if the respondents lied but there would be no gain to them by lying. Their responses appeared to be truthful which again is evident by the consistency of their responses.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Chapter II will review the literature in two areas. One is the young offenders' adjustment in the community following their release from secure custody and the other is the young offenders' views of their program experiences within a correctional institution. Within this literature review, community adjustment will be considered first.

1. COMMUNITY ADJUSTMENT

A review of the correctional literature found a real debate as to whether or not correctional institution programs help the young offenders adjust within the community.

Greenberg (1977), Lipton, Martinson and Wilks (1975) and Robison and Smith (1971) reviewed evaluations of programs and concluded that these programs had not helped the offenders adjust in the community. An article published by Martinson (1974), which was based on his research with Lipton and Wilks on correctional institution programs from 1945 - 67, concluded that their lack of positive findings was either the results of ineffectual programs or faulty research. Martinson listed several conclusions as to why those programs were ineffective. One was that

correctional programs were just not good enough and the second one was that they were based on faulty theories of crime.

Palmer (1975) examined Lipton, Martinson and Wilks report and found major shortcomings in the quality of their reviews and in the methodology of the studies on which the reviews were based. He claimed that many of the correctional programs that they reviewed were effective for certain kinds of offenders under certain conditions.

Gendreau and Ross (1979) examined correctional programs from 1973-1978 and found five issues that led to programs not helping the offender adjust in the community. These were characterized by: the reliance on a single method of intervention, reliance on a single outcome measure to assess community adjustment, the lack of understanding of individual differences within the correctional population, not offering enough treatment over an adequate length of time and a lack of interaction amongst agencies.

In 1981, Ross and Fabiano stated that correctional programs that helped the offenders adjust in the community were rare. The ones that had been demonstrated to help, according to Ross and Fabiano (1981), included a number of the following components.

- 1) They were multifaceted. They did not rely on a single method but utilized a variety of strategies in their intervention with the offender.
- 2) They were based on models that explained illegal behaviour. Many were based on the social learning model and aimed to teach offenders new anti-criminal

attitudes and behaviours.

- 3) They were intensive by providing high quality intervention for adequate periods of time.
- 4) They were well managed programs.
- 5) They attended to those environmental factors which supported delinquent behaviour or prevented pro-social adaptation.
- 6) They encouraged the offenders' peer group to reinforce each other's positive behaviour and to neutralize the offenders' peer group which reinforced anti-social behaviour.
- 7) They had correctional workers who related well to the offenders in warm, flexible and enthusiastic ways and who could do so without compromising the institutional rules.
- 8) They had correctional workers who were positive role models and who reinforced pro-social and non-criminal ways of thinking and behaving.
- 9) They engaged the offender in working on personal, social and vocational problems.

Grissom and Dubnov (1989) reviewed the literature and found additional studies that identified program variables that appeared to be related to helping the young offenders adjust in the community. The variables identified were quite similar to those stated above. In addition, Grissom and Dubnov (1989) suggested other features that they found integral in the correctional institution in which they conducted a follow-up study. They were as follows:

- 1) Valuing the residents. The residents were treated with respect.
- 2) Residents' responsibility to the community. The residents learn that their appearance and behaviour reflects upon the institution. They were expected to dress and act appropriately and to support peers' positive behaviours.
- 3) Emphasis upon current and future behaviour.
- 4) Low staff to resident ratio.
- 5) Emphasis upon teamwork and mutual support among all staff.
- 6) Fiscal consciousness. The staff were aware of the institution's financial situation and priorities.
- 7) Quality environment.

✱ In Cullen and Gendreau (1989) review of the literature, they found that programs that helped the offenders adjustment in the community were based on a model which included both theory and intervention strategies. They listed the intervention strategies which were anti-criminal modelling, problem solving, utilizing community resources, quality interpersonal relationships, authority and relapse prevention. Further, they found that these strategies were based on overlapping theories such as social learning, cognitive methods, skills training, differential association and behavioural.

In Denis Romig's book Justice for Our Children (1979) Romig presents a review of youth programs that claimed to have helped the young offenders adjust in the community and those that did not. Based on this review, he outlined the ingredients of those programs that appeared to help the young offender. More specifically,

Romig identified skills that had been documented as improving the youths community adjustment. These skills were: communication, daily living and survival, career and education advancement and study skills that result in a certificate that supports career goals.

These issues discussed above on whether or not correctional institutional programs help the young offenders adjust in the community or which programs or program components appear to help are still being debated by researchers today.

The next section of the literature review will describe follow-up studies that examined community adjustment and their methodological approaches utilized. Few studies were found that focused on the young offenders adjustment in the community following a period of secure custody. Jenkins (1990) found that studies focused on the programs' internal processes such as the residents' enrolments, withdraws, outcomes and gains measured on tests as opposed to following up the residents in terms of their adjustment in the community and their ability to live crime free lives upon release. In addition, he noted that the studies that do exist were poorly executed with methodological flaws. Studies that focus on internal processes have little utility for this literature review as this follow-up study is not evaluating an institutional program(s). Jenkins review is helpful only because it concurs with other literature covered by this review, namely that there are few studies that focus on community adjustment.

During the search follow-up studies were found in other disciplines such as mental health and child welfare. These were useful as in one article, written by Allerhand, Weber and Polansky (1961), they discuss the fact that a follow-up study is not the same as an evaluation. An evaluation provides information on what would have become of subjects if the intervention was not applied by conducting a complete experiment where subjects are assigned to "treated" and "control" groups. Whereas, a follow-up study does not provide this insight. They also make references to guidelines that they believe should be used in any follow-up study such as specifying the cases involved and the intervention that was experienced.

The follow-up studies that were located varied in their measurement of community adjustment. The most commonly used measure of community adjustment appeared to be recidivism rates. The following studies are some examples.

Traynelis - Yurek and Giarobbe (1988), Benda (1987), Laulicht (1962) and Maskin (1974) followed up young offenders from correctional institutions and measured community adjustment by recidivism. They all defined recidivism differently. For example, some of them defined recidivism as apprehension for an illegal act, a charge of an illegal act or a return to a correctional facility. Traynelis - Yurek and Giarobbe (1988) used a success rate index. The success rate index, stated as a percent, was formulated by dividing the total number of months since the youths left the institution into the total number of months not in custody since leaving.

Data for all these studies were gathered from sources other than the youths themselves. For example, data were gathered from files in the Corrections

Department, Social Welfare Department and the Youth Services Division.

In the literature, recidivism rates were seen as adequate in measuring community adjustment by many. Parlett (1981) stated that it is insufficient to show paper and pencil growth; freedom from crime and non-return to the institution must be shown. Martinson (1974) called recidivism the criteria that reflected most directly how well the correctional programs were performing the task of community adjustment. Waldo (1973) believed that unless one examines recidivism one could not say whether or not an attempt has been made to achieve the primary goal in Corrections.

Others acknowledged recidivism as a poor measure. Reppucci and Clingempeel (1978) discussed some of the difficulties with the recidivism measure. One of the major problems identified involves discretionary judgements of justice system personnel. They explained this by citing an example of a non-white, lower class urban youth arrested and returned to a correctional institution for a relatively minor offense, whereas a white, middle class suburban youth committed the same or a more serious offense and remained out on probation supervision.

Similarly, Gendreau and Leipziger (1978) felt that recidivism was one of the least understood and most elusive of measures employed in studies. The meaning of recidivism varies within the justice system. For example, depending on the source (police records, court reports or community corrections' files) used to gather recidivism data, recidivism is defined as re-arrest, breach of probation, or re-institutionalization.

Ross (1981) and Seashore and Haberfeld (1976) recommended that recidivism be supplemented by other measures of adjustment in areas such as education, employment and family. They explained that return to an institution alone provided an incomplete picture of the young offenders' experiences in the community. This single measure of recidivism was also not seen as a valid measure of community adjustment for adult offenders. Vito (1983) suggested an instrument called a relative adjustment scale to determine the adjustment of adult offenders following a period of custody. The adjustment criteria index scored behaviours which showed positive adjustment in areas such as employment, school, living situation and criminals activity. His data were obtained from the Department of Corrections.

As evident in the above, the correctional field has still not developed and agreed upon a standard method to measure community adjustment. Since the literature review has already shown examples of follow-up studies that measure the young offenders' community adjustment by one criterion of recidivism it will now cite follow-up studies that incorporated multiple measures.

Novotny and Burstein (1974) conducted a follow-up study of 94 young offenders and assessed their adjustment in the community three years after their release from a youth correctional institution in the United States. Community adjustment involved the young offenders' adjustment in school plus their reinvolverment with the law.

The adjustment in school data was obtained from the youths when they were seen for interviews. These interviews found that 68 of the 94 youths (72%) returned to school after release. Fifty-three dropped out, fourteen graduated and one was still attending.

Novotny and Burstein (1974) defined reinvolvement with the law as criminal charges and gathered the data from the youth's legal records. They found that forty percent of the youths who attended school and dropped out were reinvolvement with the law during the follow-up period. Fifty percent of the youths who never attended school after being released were reinvolvement with the law and ten percent or two of the fourteen youths who graduated from high school were reinvolvement with the law.

Their findings appeared to indicate that most of the youths had difficulties adjusting to school when they returned from a correctional institution. The youths revealed to the researchers that they had problems getting along with other people and adhering to the standards of conduct expected of them in the school. Some of the youths who graduated indicated to the researchers that they had some support from a supervised environment and gave examples of family members, other relatives, foster parents, Social Workers and Probation Officers. The others had some involvements in activities such as athletics. On the basis of this information, Novotny and Burstein (1974) suggested that a plan should be developed by the correctional institution to prepare young offenders for making the adjustment to school and to assist them in school for a long period of time.

Hunt and Hoffman (1975) conducted a follow-up study of 101 young offenders and assessed their community adjustment one year after their release from youth training schools (correctional institutions) in Iowa. Community adjustment focused on the young offenders' vocational, educational, and financial situation plus their recidivism.

The criteria used by Hunt and Hoffman (1975) to determine recidivism was either a new offence which resulted in a return to the training school, an adult jail or prison or placement on probation supervision. The data was gathered from the Department of Social Services and showed that 29% of the sample did not recidivate whereas 71% did.

On the basis of an interview with each subject, Hunt and Hoffman (1975) provided a descriptive picture of the youths. Forty-seven of the subjects experienced work in the community, seventy-two subjects enrolled in school, and thirty-three of the subjects had income below \$3,000.00 per year.

Hunt and Hoffman (1975) also elicited the youths' opinions and perceptions about their experiences in the institution's programs. The youths' general assessment of the programs were that they were not helpful to them and that they can only help themselves. The researchers asked the youths to rate each program they participated in by indicating if they liked, disliked or were indifferent to it and to identify reasons for their ratings. The youths made recommendations for changes in programs and identified a number of specific changes. They also gave suggestions for additional programs. Three of the most cited program suggestions by the youths

were independent living, drivers education and more small group and individual counselling.

On the basis of their findings, the researchers recommended the closing of the institutions and the development of community based correctional programs. They did acknowledge that a small minority of youths needed to be in a correctional facility and recommended an existing institution that provided a more humane - appearing atmosphere.

Barton and Sarri (1976) conducted a follow-up study of 194 young offenders and assessed their adjustment in the community one to three years after their participation in a correctional institution. Their method of gathering data was by mailing questionnaires to the youths asking them to describe their involvement in conventional and delinquent activities and to assess the institutional programs that they participated in.

Barton and Sarri (1976) found that sixty-percent of the sample had experienced school and work since their release. They described these situations as "less than ideal." This was based on the youths revealing to the researchers that they were employed part time, their salaries were low, they changed their jobs many times, they were suspended or had high truancy rates in school. Forty percent of the sample were neither in school or work.

The questionnaire also asked the youths about their delinquent activities. Barton and Sarri (1976) found their contact with the law enforcement was wide spread. For example, 42% were brought before the Judge, 38% had been arrested,

27% were convicted of an offence and 15% were in a detention facility.

These researchers also solicited the youths' views of their program experiences. The majority of the youths thought that the programs helped them somewhat in the community and some claimed that they helped a lot. Only a few reported that none of the programs were helpful. The specific programs rated the most favourable by the youths were counselling and the school program.

Barton and Sarri (1976) concluded that these youths released from a correctional facility returned to their pre-institution environment and were no more prepared for their futures. They did not make any specific recommendations to the correctional institutions based on their study.

Anderson (1981) conducted a follow-up study of 24 young offenders and assessed their community adjustment within their first year of being released from a youth correctional institution in Illinois. Community adjustment focused on work and recidivism.

Anderson (1981) obtained the young offenders' adjustment in work data through an interview with the youths. The interviews revealed that eighteen of the respondents were employed full time while six were unemployed and seeking employment. Over half of them claimed to the researchers that the institution programs were helpful in preparing them for employment and they rated the programs above average. Half of them believed that the programs did not assist them in obtaining a job in the community.

Anderson (1981) gathered the recidivism data from legal records and found that four of the sample had been confined for criminal conduct.

The researcher concluded that the programs helped the youths adjust to work in the community but did not assist them in finding work. The youths revealed that they took whatever jobs they could get, ended up in the job that they had prior to custody or used the contacts of families or friends to find employment. Anderson (1981) recommended a plan to the correctional institution which expands the program and helps the youths find meaningful work in the community.

Webb and Scalon (1981) conducted a follow-up study of 64 young offenders and assessed their adjustment in the community three years after their release from a correctional institution in Georgia. Community adjustment focused on recidivism and adjustment in community counselling, educational and vocational settings.

The researchers surveyed community correctional staff to obtain program adjustment data. According to the staff ratings, 72% of the sample responded favourably to counselling, 77% adjusted favourably to their education program and 40% adjusted favourably in a vocational setting.

Webb and Scalon (1981) obtained the recidivism data from records in Georgia's Youth Service Division and Department of Corrections. They defined recidivism as recommitted to a youth institution or to an adult state prison and found that forty-four percent of the sample were in custody.

A study conducted by Grissom and Dubnov (1989) assessed the community adjustment of 41 young offenders three years after their release from the Glen Mills Correctional Institution in Pennsylvania. They conducted in person and telephone interviews with the young offenders. The young offenders were asked about their views of the programs at the institution and their community experiences with employment, education and training since release. Their recidivism rates were obtained from the juvenile and adult court records. ...

According to Grissom and Dubnov (1989) the youths provided favourable responses to the academic, athletic and vocational programs within the institution. Overall, more than two thirds of them said that the programs were helpful.

The researchers found that the youths were involved in a variety of activities in the community such as school, training programs and employment. For example, 2% were in school, 1% in college, 4% in a vocational training program, 1% in the military, 27% were employed full time, 15% were employed part time and 39% were unemployed. Concerning recidivism, 13% were in custody.

Grissom and Dubnov (1989) concluded that community reintegration is a concern for the institution and they recommended one solution to this problem which was an intensive reintegration program. This included approaches such as preparing the residents for progressively increased involvement in the community, development of understandings and commitments between the resident and existing community support systems, e.g., family, schools, employers, and monitoring the ability of the residents and the community to productively interact with each other.

These follow-up studies that used multiple measures appear to provide more information about what happens with the young offender in their community when they are released from a correctional institution. They include more than just information on reinvolverment with the law and consider such experiences as school and work. In addition, they help the reader in determining what needs to be strengthened in the institution and the community to help the young offenders adjust.

2. VIEWS OF PROGRAM EXPERIENCES

The literature review will now turn to the second area which is the young offenders' views of their program experiences within the correctional institution. All but one of the last six follow-up studies described above involved personal interviews with the young offenders to find out what really happened to them after their release from the institution and how they adjusted into their communities. These studies also solicited the young offenders' views of their program experiences within the institution. This method of following up directly with the offender to solicit their viewpoints of their program experiences was discussed in the literature in the 1950's and 60's at some length by Simpson, Eynon and Reckless (1961) and Corsini and Bartleme (1953). These researchers support the notion that the subjects' know what they get out of their program experiences in a correctional institution

and what has helped them the most. There does not appear to be much discussion in the literature today on this method yet there is some evidence that it is being used. The following studies are some examples of the methodologies used to solicit young offenders' views of their program experiences.

Simpson, Eynon and Reckless (1961) interviewed 372 young offenders who experienced a correctional school in Ohio with regards to their perceptions of their institutional experience. A series of questions were prepared to determine whether the boys felt that the program experiences helped them in the community. They found that the majority of the sample perceived no improvements with themselves from the institutional program experience. Simpson, Eynon & Reckless (1961) explained this negative appraisal as the tendency of young offenders to regard their period of custody as punishment and "lost time" and therefore, they can not consider benefits which might have been derived.

Corsini and Bartleme (1953) interviewed 50 young offenders and asked them twelve questions regarding their institutional experiences. Two questions of interest to this literature review were: if the resident had himself benefitted from the institution experience and specific suggestions from the resident for changes to the programs. With regards to the first question their findings were the opposite to the above study in which almost three quarters of the sample said that they had benefited from the programs in the institution. Secondly, when the residents were asked for specific changes, the researchers found considerable reluctance or a lack of suggestions. Almost half did not respond to the question. Those who did respond

suggested more psychiatric service and better educational-vocational activities.

Two studies which were summarized by Reckless (1955) revealed young offenders' opinions about their institutional experiences. One of these studies, reported by Sabnis (1951) administered a questionnaire to 120 young offenders just before departure from a Training School for Boys. Sabnis found that eighty percent responded positively to the question that the experiences in the institution would help them in the community. In regards to the question of what programs the youth benefitted the most from they identified the Group Therapy Program, the Health and the Chaplaincy Services. The other study, by Zibners (1954), interviewed 100 young offenders released from a Youth Residential Centre. Zibner asked seven questions. The two of most interest to this literature review were: Do you think you benefitted from the Centre? and Will your experience at the Centre help you in the community? Both questions received favourable responses from the youths. Zibners other questions focused on who the youths benefitted from in the institution as opposed to what programs did the youths benefit from. His question yielded the answers that the youths benefitted from the cottage worker or recreation worker as opposed to the professional worker such as the psychiatrist or social worker.

CHAPTER III

METHODS

Chapter III presents the design of the study including how the sample was selected and how the data was collected.

The follow-up study was based on the qualitative research model. According to Luna and Price (1992) this research model describes in depth and detail experiences, thoughts and the perceptions of people. There are several different qualitative research methodologies and this study chose the interview method. Young offenders were asked questions orally about their community adjustment and their views on the correctional institution programs and their answers were recorded on tape or written on the questionnaire.

1. THE SAMPLE

The following criteria were used to select the subjects for the follow-up study:

- 1) Year of discharge from the centre is 1991.
- 2) Had been in secure custody for three months or more.
- 3) Discharge address is Winnipeg.

The reasons for using these criteria were as follows. First of all, the year 1991 was chosen because the data were not going to be collected till August of 1992. The

youths would have been released for at least six months prior to conducting the interview. Therefore, this allowed for a reasonable amount of time for adjustment in the community. The length of follow-up was not a major issue in the current literature and studies appeared to use a wide range of lengths for all kinds of reasons. Secondly, it was necessary that the youths had the opportunity to experience a few programs in secure custody. Hence, the period three months or more in secure custody was selected. Thirdly, discharge to an address in Winnipeg was used to make it easier to locate the youths. Also, the majority of youths in secure custody at the Manitoba Youth Centre are from Winnipeg. Manitoba has two youth correctional institutions in the Province. A directive released in 1990 from the Community and Youth Corrections Directorate designated the Manitoba Youth Centre as the custody (secure and open) facility for youths from Winnipeg and Agassiz Youth Centre in Portage La Prairie, Manitoba as the facility for all young offenders sentenced to custody from rural and northern Manitoba. It should be noted that in practice there could be an exception to this directive, therefore, the writer used it as one of the criterion. It should also be mentioned that the above explanation excludes female young offenders. In the Province of Manitoba, Youth Corrections has one correctional facility for female young offenders who are sentenced to secure custody and the location is the Manitoba Youth Centre. More specifically, one cottage in the Centre has been designated for all female offenders and it has been named Doncaster Centre.

The Manitoba Youth Centre's log book that records all the releases from secure custody in 1991 was reviewed. The names of sixty youths (male and female), who were released from secure custody in 1991, were found. The next step was to review all sixty institution files and to select the subjects based on the criteria. Thirty-four youth met the criteria. Twenty-five had not been in secure custody for three months or more. Their sentences to secure custody ranged from five days to sixty days or two months. The other youth was in secure custody for six months but was released to a Brandon, Manitoba address. In addition, five out of the twenty-six youths were from northern Manitoba. Incidentally, these five youths were all female and were sentenced to secure custody from six days to thirty days.

The thirty-four youths who met the criteria were composed of thirty-three males and one female. A decision was made not to use the female subject even though she met the criteria. The reason for excluding the one female was that there could be too many differences between the male and female offender and by omitting the female the sample would become more homogeneous.

Therefore, thirty-three young offenders had spent three months or more in secure custody and were released in 1991 to a Winnipeg address.

The institution files were reviewed and information relevant to the study was extracted. The items sought from the files were listed on a single instrument, the File Information Form. (Appendix B)

The File Information Form was composed of three areas. One section listed the specifics on when the youths were released and the address and phone number on

where the youths were released to. In addition information on the youths' parents, Social Worker, Probation Officer and lawyer were also documented to assist in locating the youths. The second section contained items relating to the youths, e.g., birth date, ethnic origin, education level, offence(s) committed to custody, prior offence(s) and disposition(s), abuse disclosure, substance abuse disclosure and programs experienced during secure custody. The third section was for documenting the procedures taken in locating the subjects.

Approximately, one hour was required to complete each File Information Form.

One of the problems experienced with the institution's files was the incompleteness of the file. Some of them did not include the programs that the residents experienced while in secure custody. Programs such as Social Thinking Skills, Substance Abuse Intervention and Sexual Offender Program appeared to be documented whereas other programs such as Resident Employment Program, Religious Education Program and specific classes in the Academic Education Program were not mentioned. In addition, information on whether or not the residents completed the programs were not available in most files.

This absence of information did not effect the study as the youths were asked during the interviews to identify each program they attended, but it raises concern that this information was not recorded consistently and thoroughly in the residents' files.

The File Information Form was not pre-tested on a separate population of youths' files but was revised once during the file study. The revisions were minor. One was reordering the questions on the form so that it followed more closely the institution file format. Secondly, spacing the questions so that there was more room to write the information and thirdly, recording information on the youths contact with their natural father. This variable was added to the form because while reading the files the absence of a father kept on resurfacing. This issue of absent fathers is being explored by a growing number of researchers. They believe that this weak father/son relationship is the root of many men's problems and they link it to a range of problems including trouble with the law. After changes were made to the form files from which information had already been gathered were redone on the revised item.

2. LOCATING THE SAMPLE

The first step in locating the sample consisted of reviewing the population list at the Manitoba Youth Centre and Adult Corrections. Thirteen youths within the sample were in custody either at the Manitoba Youth Centre or Headingly Correctional Institution. That left twenty youths believed to be living in the community.

A letter was composed which informed the youths of the study and requested their help. (Appendix C) It also included the researcher's office phone number so the youths could make contact to set up an interview. Prior to sending out the letter, it was pre-tested on four residents in secure custody at the Manitoba Youth Centre who met all the criteria of the study except were not discharged. They each reviewed the letter individually. They were then asked if they understood it and if it would make them interested in participating in the study. Their feedback resulted in the letter being modified. Basically, they reported that they all understood the letter. There were a few words that the youths identified that they did not understand and therefore, they were replaced by other words that were suggested by them. The youths all indicated that they would participate in the study if they received the letter but were not sure about their peers participating voluntarily. They indicated to the writer that once youths were released from the Manitoba Youth Centre they really do not want to have anything more to do with it. They suggested to emphasize in the letter that these youths "had been chosen" and that their participation in the study "will help" other youths.

The letters were sent out to the sample in July of 1992. It was decided to interview those in custody first. The correctional facilities such as the Manitoba Youth Centre, Headingly Correctional Institution and the Winnipeg Remand Centre were all very cooperative and accommodated the interviews. Following those interviews the youths in the community were located. Each letter was followed up by a phone call or a home visit for those who did not have a phone. Once the

contacts were made with the youths the interviews were scheduled immediately.

3. INTERVIEWS

Luna and Price (1992) identify several descriptive research methodologies that could be used to gather information pertaining to the youths' community adjustment since leaving secure custody and their views of their program experiences. It was felt that the interview method would be the most effective due to the youths lack of experience with formal written questionnaires and their low education level.

A review of the literature was conducted to examine the format and the language of other interview forms used with young offenders. The interview form was constructed with two purposes: One was to obtain information on the youths' adjustment in the community and the other was to gain information on the youths' views of their program experiences. (Appendix D) It contained two sections. Section one gathered information on community adjustment. These questions focused on the youths' living situation, education and employment involvement, community participation and reinvolverment with the law since being released from the Manitoba Youth Centre. Section two gathered information on program experiences. The youths rated and commented on each program they participated in, discussed their benefits and suggested additional programs. The interview form was pre-tested on four youths. These youths were also asked about how they found

the questionnaire. They indicated to the writer that they had no problems with it and they had no suggestions for changing the form. A couple of changes were made to the forms based on the respondent's answers to the questions. First of all, a question needed to be added which asked the youths "what they did with their time?" In the first four interviews some youths indicated that they did not attend school or work, therefore, the question needed to be included so that the information on what they were doing could be captured. Secondly, in the program experience section, respondents had a difficult time differentiating between which Academic Education classes they participated in. Hence, the order of the programs were changed to ask information about the most obvious programs first.

After the revisions, the questionnaire was comprised of a total of nineteen questions. The time needed to conduct each interview was approximately one and a half hours and was held at a time and place most convenient for the youths. Twenty-eight interviews were conducted and they took place in private homes (4), the Manitoba Youth Centre (9), Headingly Correctional Institution (5), Community Corrections Offices (4), Winnipeg Remand Centre (2), restaurants (3), and over the telephone (1).

Some of the problems encountered were the difficulties in locating youths for the interviews, locating some of the parents of those youths under 18 years of age to obtain their permission to interview their child and the youths in the community showing up for their interviews. Several sources were utilized in attempting to locate the youths: Manitoba Youth Centre files, Community and Youth Corrections

records, Community Corrections workers, Manitoba Adult Corrections records, Child & Family Services of Winnipeg workers, Alberta Corrections Department records, the Manitoba Telephone System, and the youths' parents or relatives. The reason for contacting Alberta Corrections Department was that two youths were reported to have left the province and it was suspected by a parent and a Community Corrections worker that both of them were in the Province of Alberta and possibly in conflict with the law.

These sources were all helpful in supplying information on how to locate the youths. One exception was that there were a small group of parents who were not supportive over the telephone. They would not cooperate with the study and also expressed negative comments about the Manitoba Youth Centre. It should be noted that these parents were the parents of the five youths that the study was unable to locate.

It should also be mentioned that overall the parent(s) were very supportive and some of them suggested that a study be conducted on their experiences as a parent of a youth within the Youth Justice System. A few parents requested a copy of this report.

Prior to the interview questions, each subject had to sign an Interview Consent Form to show their understanding of their involvement. (Appendix E) This form reviewed the purpose of the study, commented on confidentiality and the rights of the subjects to refuse to answer any questions or withdraw from the interview at any time. Because ten youths were under 18 years of age, their parents or guardians

were required to sign the form. This proved to be a difficult task as it took several attempts to locate the parents. Once the parent(s) were located they were very supportive and agreed to sign the form.

Overall, the twenty-eight youths who were located were quite willing to participate voluntarily. Not surprisingly, those in the community were more difficult to arrange meetings with as opposed to those in a correctional facility. On several occasions the youths in the community did not show up for the interview or rescheduled at the last minute.

The actual interview was not begun until any questions the youths had were answered. They were also given the choice as to whether or not they wanted to be taped. Most interviews were taped and detailed notes were taken in the other cases.

4. COMPILATION OF THE DATA

After completion of each interview the responses were transcribed from the tapes onto each questionnaire. All the replies were then tabulated under each question.

In the analysis of the data the replies were reviewed to determine major themes and issues.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Chapter IV presents the data in three parts. Part one consists of a description of the sample. The focus of the second part is the subjects' experiences in the community. Part three is the subjects' views of their program experiences in secure custody at the Manitoba Youth Centre.

1. THE SAMPLE

The sample consists of 28 former residents. The following is basic demographic data on the sample. The data were gathered from the subjects' file at the Manitoba Youth Centre.

Age

The average age of the sample was 17. The subject's ages ranged from 13 to 20 years old. (Table 1)

TABLE 1. AGE

AGE	% (N)
13 YEARS OLD	3.5 (1)
14 YEARS OLD	0
15 YEARS OLD	11 (3)
16 YEARS OLD	11 (3)
17 YEARS OLD	18 (5)
18 YEARS OLD	25 (7)
19 YEARS OLD	29 (8)
20 YEARS OLD	3.5 (1)
TOTAL	100 (28)

Ethnic Origin

Youths of Metis ethnicity were the largest group in the sample (36%). Caucasian youths represented the second largest group at thirty-two percent (32%) and Native youths represented the third largest group (21.5%). The remaining ten and a half percentage (10.5%) was composed of one Black, one East Indian and one Chilean youth. (Table 2)

Most of the sample (68%) were visible minorities and fifty-seven and a half percentage (57.5%) Aboriginal (Metis and Native) origin.

TABLE 2. ETHNIC ORIGIN

ETHNIC ORIGIN	% (N)
METIS	36 (10)
CAUCASIAN	32 (9)
NATIVE	21.5 (6)
BLACK	3.5 (1)
EAST INDIAN	3.5 (1)
CHILEAN	3.5 (1)
TOTAL	100 (28)

Education Level

The average educational level was grade 8. The education level ranged from grade 6 to 11. (Table 3)

TABLE 3. EDUCATION LEVEL

EDUCATION LEVEL	% (N)
6	4 (1)
7	14 (4)
8	36 (10)
9	32 (9)
10	7 (2)
11	7 (2)
TOTAL	100 (28)

Wardship

Twenty-five percent (25%) of the sample were wards of Child and Family Services.

Contact with Natural Father

Seventy-nine percent (79%) of the sample had limited contact with their natural father. Some of the reasons were that parents separated or divorced while the subjects were children, subjects were adopted as a baby, or fathers were deceased.

Substance Abuse

Seventy-one percent (71%) of the sample identified substance abuse as a problem for themselves. The substance most often mentioned was alcohol.

Child Abuse Disclosure

Three subjects (11%) had disclosed that they had been victims of child abuse.

Length of time in Secure Custody

The average length of time that the sample was in secure custody was seven months. The subject's length of time varied considerably in months, ranging from three to twenty-eight. (Table 4)

TABLE 4. LENGTH OF TIME IN SECURE CUSTODY

LENGTH OF TIME IN SECURE CUSTODY	% (N)
3 MONTHS	29 (8)
4 MONTHS	18 (5)
5 MONTHS	11 (3)
6 MONTHS	7 (2)
7 MONTHS	14 (4)
8 MONTHS	3.5 (1)
12 MONTHS	3.5 (1)
13 MONTHS	7 (2)
14 MONTHS	3.5 (1)
28 MONTHS	3.5 (1)
TOTAL	100 (28)

Offence(s) committed to Secure Custody

The majority of the sample (86%) were committed to secure custody on property offence(s). A third of them (33%) were committed on offence(s) such as Break and Enter (B. & E.), Possession of Goods Obtained by Crime (P.G.O.B.C.) and Theft. Another third (37%) had an additional offence which was either Fail to Comply to Probation Order (F.T.C.P.O.), Unlawfully At Large (U.A.L.), Escape Lawful Custody (E.L.C.), or Fail To Appear. The last third (30%) had an offence assaultive in nature, e.g., Sexual Assault and Assault Causing Bodily Harm (A.C.B.H.), plus property offence(s).

The remainder of the sample (14%) were committed on one of the following offences: Assault Causing Bodily Harm, Robbery, Possession of Narcotics and Trafficking of Narcotics. (Table 5)

TABLE 5. OFFENCE(S) COMMITTED TO SECURE CUSTODY

COMMITTED OFFENCE(S)	% (N)
PROPERTY (B. & E., THEFT, P.G.O.B.C.)	29 (8)
PROPERTY PLUS OTHER (U.A.L., E.L.C., F.T.C.P.O., FAIL TO APPEAR)	32 (9)
ASSAULTS (A.C.B.H., SEXUAL ASSAULT) PLUS PROPERTY	25 (7)
ASSAULT CAUSING BODILY HARM (3 CHARGES)	3.5 (1)
ROBBERY	3.5 (1)
POSSESSION OF NARCOTICS	3.5 (1)
TRAFFICKING OF NARCOTICS	3.5 (1)
TOTAL	100 (28)

Prior Offence(s)

Only three subjects (11%) had no prior offence. Eighty-nine percent (89%) had prior offences totalling 224. The average number of prior offences was eight.

(Table 6)

TABLE 6. PRIOR OFFENCE(S)

PRIOR OFFENCE(S)	% (N)
PROPERTY PLUS OTHER (U.A.L., E.L.C., F.T.C.P.O., FAIL TO APPEAR)	28.5 (8)
PROPERTY PLUS ASSAULTS (A.C.B.H., SEXUAL ASSAULT)	17 (5)
PROPERTY (B. & E., THEFT, P.G.O.B.C.)	11 (3)
COMBINATION OF ALL ABOVE OFFENCE	3.5 (1)
PROPERTY PLUS POSSESSION OF NARCOTICS	11 (3)
ABOVE PLUS OTHER (U.A.L., E.L.C., F.T.C.P.O., FAIL TO APPEAR)	11 (3)
NIL	11 (3)
ASSAULT	3.5 (1)
POSSESSION OF NARCOTICS	3.5 (1)
TOTAL	100 (28)

Dispositions of Prior Offences

These prior offences were disposed of by way of a fine, community service work, probation supervision, open custody and secure custody. This order of dispositions (a less severe disposition such as a fine to a more severe disposition such as secure custody) was observed within the files based on the subject's number of prior offences. For example, the more offences the subjects had the more

dispositions the subjects experienced. Ninety-two percent (92%) of those who had a prior offence had been on probation supervision and forty percent (40%) had spent some time, in their past, in secure custody. (Table 7)

TABLE 7. DISPOSITIONS OF PRIOR OFFENCE(S)

DISPOSITIONS	% (N = 25)
FINE	24 (6)
COMMUNITY SERVICE WORK	56 (14)
PROBATION SUPERVISION	92 (23)
OPEN CUSTODY	60 (15)
SECURE CUSTODY	40 (10)

In summarizing the demographic data, the sample were seventeen year old Aborigines with a grade eight education. They had limited contact with their natural father and identified alcohol abuse as a problem for themselves. They were known within the Youth Justice System as most of them had experienced other dispositions in their past such as probation supervision and open custody. Almost all of them were committed on property offences and their average time in secure custody was seven months.

2. EXPERIENCES IN THE COMMUNITY

The following is a description of the subjects' experiences in the community following their release from secure custody at the Manitoba Youth Centre. This data were gathered by the writer during the interviews with the subjects.

Living Situation

When subjects' were released from the Manitoba Youth Centre, the majority (64%) went to live with their family. In most of these cases (89%) their families were parents or a parent. (Table 8)

TABLE 8. LIVING SITUATION WHEN RELEASED

LIVING SITUATION	% (N)
FAMILY	64 (18)
COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS/CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES HOME	18 (5)
ALONE	11 (3)
TREATMENT CENTRE	3.5 (1)
THE STREET	3.5 (1)
TOTAL	100 (28)

At the time of the interview, eleven percent of the sample were still living in the same place, that is, with their parent or parents. Eighty-nine percent (89%) had lived in more than one place. They lived in places such as a correctional facility, with family, a friend or alone. One subject could not identify a fixed address and

described himself as "roaming from place to place." One subject spent a period of time in a psychiatric ward of a hospital. A majority of the sample (60%) were living in a correctional facility. Of those, fifty-nine percent (59%) were in a facility for their first time since release. The remaining forty-one percent (41%) had been in a facility more than once since their release. (Table 9)

TABLE 9. PRESENT LIVING SITUATION

LIVING SITUATION	% (N)
<u>CORRECTIONAL FACILITY</u> (60%)	
Manitoba Youth Centre	32 (9)
Headingly Correctional Institution	17 (5)
Winnipeg Remand Centre	7 (2)
Correctional Services Canada Halfway House	4 (1)
<u>COMMUNITY</u> (40%)	
With parents or parent	25 (7)
Alone	7 (2)
With a friend	4 (1)
With a cousin	4 (1)
TOTAL	100 (28)

Education

Since leaving the Manitoba Youth Centre, fifty-seven percent (57%) of the sample had either attended school or a training program. (Table 10)

TABLE 10. SCHOOL/TRAINING PROGRAM ATTENDED

SCHOOL/TRAINING PROGRAM	N
SISLER HIGH	2
RB RUSSELL	5
DANIEL MAC	3
ADULT EDUCATION	2
JOHN TAYLOR	1
GENERAL WOLFE	1
KELVIN	1
SOUTH WINNIPEG TECHNICAL CENTRE	1
YOUTH EMPLOYMENT CORE	1
NATIVE CLAN	1
CORRESPONDENCE COURSE	1
MILES MAC	2
WORK ORIENTATION WORKSHOP	4

Only one of the subjects continued with their education or training program. The subjects attended from a half day to ten months (40 weeks) before they withdrew. The average length of time in school or training program was just under two and a half months (10 weeks). The most common reasons for withdrawing were a lack of interest and problems adjusting. According to the subjects, many of the problems they faced were in relation to rules or expectations. These subjects tended not to agree or conform to certain rules or expectations that resulted in problems with the authorities of these schools and programs. Other reasons for withdrawing were financial difficulties, alcohol and drug problems and a return to crime.

At the time of the interview, four subjects (14%) were attending an educational institution or a training program. All, but one, had at least one other experience at an educational institution or training program since their release from the Manitoba Youth Centre.

Employment

Since leaving the Manitoba Youth Centre, fifty-four percent (54%) of the sample had been employed for at least some of the time.

Almost half (47%) of them had jobs in the cleaning area, e.g., cleaning offices, cars, hotels and outdoor work sites. Other kinds of jobs experienced were fast food restaurant work, e.g., Wendy's, Harvey's and Salisbury House and sales, carpentry, landscape, home renovations, game's attendant at the Red River Exhibition, picture

framer, courier, furniture mover, and clerk. These jobs were a combination of full time, part time and occasional work. Forty percent (40%) of them were midnight shifts.

At the time of the interview, the subjects were no longer in those jobs. They had been in the work force anywhere from one week to eleven months (44 weeks). The average length of time that the subjects were in the work force was seventeen weeks. Six of the subjects had more than one job. Therefore, the average length of time that the subjects were in one job was for three months (12 weeks).

Over half (53%) quit their job. The most common reasons for quitting were that the subjects were unsatisfied with the kind of work that was required, their manager and their hours. Other reasons for quitting were low wages, not enough hours, lost interest, wanted the summer off to collect Unemployment Insurance and admitted into the hospital for mental health problems. The others (47%) were not working because the job was seasonal or they were fired, laid off or picked up by the police and detained in custody.

Community Participation

Since leaving the Manitoba Youth Centre thirty-nine percent (39%) of the sample had participated in community activities. Almost half (46%) of them identified participation in a variety of activities at Drop In Centres such as the Oriole Community Centre, Arlington Drop In, Rossbrook House, Pritchard House and Youth For Christ Fire Hall. The others identified participation in volunteer work

within their community (18%), organized sport activities through the local school or community club (18%) and Alcoholic's Anonymous meetings (18%).

In a typical week, most of the sample spent their time, approximately twenty-four hours, watching TV. Their next most popular activity was drinking. Those who drank spent approximately nineteen hours a week drinking. While discussing this activity the interviewer noted that the respondents either tried to suggest that they never touched alcohol or that they drank a lot and could handle it. The third most popular activity identified was playing sports. Football was mentioned the most often followed by basketball and hockey. The interviewer noted that the respondents tried to give the impression that they really liked sports and that they played them a lot. Reading was next followed by hobbies. Most were not sure what the interviewer meant by a "hobby." Forty-six percent (46%) identified involvement in a hobby. The hobby most often mentioned involved music, e.g., listening to music, collecting cassettes and playing an instrument. Physical activities such as weight training and martial arts were identified as the second most popular hobby.

Eighty-nine percent (89%) of the sample identified additional activities. One third spent their time with their girlfriend, family and relatives, playing games such as cards and Nintendo, fixing cars and exercising and jogging. Another third indicated that their time was spent doing crime, partying, drinking and smoking. The last third spent their time hanging out in pool halls, malls, streets and bars.

Reinvolvement with the Law

Since leaving the Manitoba Youth Centre, eighty-nine percent (89%) of the sample had come in contact with the police. All of them except two had been charged with an offence(s) by the police. These two exceptions were questioned by the police and released.

Eighty-two percent (82%) of the sample had been charged with an offence(s) by the police. The total number of charges was 172. They ranged from property offences, Fail to Comply, Unlawfully at Large, Escape Lawful Custody and Assault, to a combination of all of these. At the time of the interview, seventy-eight percent (78%) of them had attended court with a total of 119 offences. The offences that had been disposed of were property offences, e.g., Break and Enter, Possession of Goods Obtained by Crime, Theft and Mischief (44%), a combination of property offences, an Unlawfully at Large and an Assault (39%) and an Escape Lawful Custody, Assaults (2) and a Narcotic Trafficking offence (17%). Eighty-three percent (83%) of these offence were disposed of by way of a custody disposition either secure or open custody within the Youth Justice System or secure custody within the Criminal Justice System. The rest (17%) were disposed of by probation supervision, a fine or community service work.

Ten subjects had a total of fifty-three allegations and were awaiting court. Seven of them were awaiting court in custody while three were on bail. Five of the ten had appeared in court on other charges since their release. (Table 11)

TABLE 11. REINVOLVEMENT WITH THE LAW

OFFENCE(S)	DISPOSITIONS	AWAITING COURT	
		IN CUSTODY	BAIL
PROPERTY OFFENCE(S)	PROBATION SUPERVISION (1) COMMUNITY SERVICE WORK (1) CUSTODY (6)		2
U.A.L. E.L.C. FAIL TO COMPLY	CUSTODY (1)		1
ASSAULT	CUSTODY (1)		
COMBINATION OF THE ABOVE	CUSTODY (7)	7	
TRAFFICKING	FINE (1)		

3. VIEWS OF PROGRAM EXPERIENCES IN SECURE CUSTODY AT THE MANITOBA YOUTH CENTRE

The subjects' rated and commented on each program that they participated in while in secure custody at the Manitoba Youth Centre. The specific ratings of each program, based on good, average or poor, are in the appendix. (Appendix F). A description of each program can be found in the Introduction (Chapter 1) of this report. The following is a summary of the samples' rating and comments.

Social Thinking Skills

Sixty-eight percent (68%) of the sample attended Social Thinking Skills. Of those, seventy-four percent (74%) rated the program "good."

The majority (89%) of the respondents talked positively about the Social Thinking Skills Program. "Social Thinking Skills helped me to stop and think." The respondents found the content relevant. They felt that they did learn steps on how to solve problems and were given the opportunity to practice the steps within the program. Two respondents (11%) found that the content was not useful and felt that the steps were not transferable to their cottage or community problems.

The comments by the respondents on the methods used by the facilitator were mixed. For example, peer discussions and the use of the video camera to practice skills were seen as positive. Some respondents expressed difficulty with the final test. They found the sixty-five percent passing grade hard to achieve. In addition,

some said they were uncomfortable with the role playing. It was suggested by respondents that the participant's overall program participation and effort be considered for the final mark.

Half the respondents commented on the facilitator and their comments were all positive. The facilitator was described as treating participants with respect. He created a good program atmosphere that was described by the respondents as relaxing and non-threatening.

A few respondents commented on the fact that they did not receive any support from their youth counsellors to use the acquired skill outside the program.

Substance Abuse Intervention

Fifty-seven percent (57%) of the sample attended Substance Abuse Intervention. Fifty percent (50%) of them rated the program as "good."

The majority (63%) of the respondents commented that the content of the program provided detailed information on substances and information on their effects. About half thought this was positive whereas the other half did not. Their complaint was that the program did not focus on intervention and there was little effort to help them understand their abuse or what to do about it.

Many respondents commented on the facilitator's over use of one particular method: the use of videos and movies. A typical response was "We watched videos everyday and sometimes twice on Friday." The graduation was commented upon as positive by the respondents. They indicated that they liked the idea of being able

to invite community visitors to the graduation. They felt that this technique used by the facilitator motivated them to do their work in order to attend the graduation.

Three respondents (19%) commented that the Program had an impact on them within the community and that they reduced their substance use.

Sexual Offender Program

Two subjects (7%) had attended the Sexual Offender Program.

Both of them rated the program "good" and commented that they found that the program focused on their sexual offense. They felt this was positive as the program did not minimize their offence and it helped them to "openly" talk about what they did, why they did it and what they needed to do to prevent it from happening again. Both of the respondents mentioned that they developed a control plan. The development of a control plan to be used outside of the program by the participant is a major component of the program.

The respondents commented that the facilitators produced an accepting atmosphere within the group. "My sexual assault was not accepted behaviour but I felt accepted, as a human being, by the group." They felt that this approach increased their desire to participate in the program and to put an effort into learning.

Resident Employment Program

Seventy-five percent (75%) of the sample attended the Resident Employment Program. Forty-three percent (43%) of them rated the program as "good."

The majority (81%) of the respondents were employed in the Cafeteria work site. They indicated that they did not know what was expected of them in their Cafeteria job. The respondents explained that they did not know what specific tasks they were responsible for when performing their duties and that they were told what to do by other residents. They said that the staff did not provide any kind of training for them and instructions were limited and "yelled" at them. The three respondents who commented on the Recreation worksite indicated they were shown how to perform their duties.

Half the respondents commented that the Cafeteria staff did not provide enough supervision for the Cafeteria worker. They referred to many incidents, within the Cafeteria, which in their opinion were not observed by staff. The respondents felt that Cafeteria staff used extreme forms of discipline. Respondents cited examples where nothing was done when youths misbehaved as well as examples where youths were fired from the Cafeteria for misbehaviour.

Sixty-seven percent (67%) of the respondents commented that the Resident Employment Program was a good opportunity to develop skills, to make money, and to have some "freedom" from the cottage structure. Most of them felt that they did learn some new skills in the areas that they worked and most felt the pay (\$1.25 per day) was too low. A few of the respondents mentioned that the pay was

unbalanced. They explained that the pay was the same for each employment area yet some areas required more work and the respondents suggested that the pay should reflect this.

Religious Education

Seventy-five percent (75%) of the sample attended the Religious Education Program. Forty-eight percent (48%) of them rated the program as "good."

Half the respondents spoke positively about the social aspect of this program. "I was able to visit with friends from other cottages and meet people from the community." Slightly less than half the respondents commented on the content and felt that they were gaining a better understanding of the Judeo-Christian heritage and were given the opportunity to participate in discussions.

Three respondents (14%) rated the program poor and commented that they felt that the issues for discussion were controlled by the facilitator and the volunteers and they were not encouraged to raise contradictory views on the topics.

Recreation

The whole sample (100%) attended Recreation. Sixty-eight percent (68%) of them rated recreation as "good."

The majority of those respondents, who rated Recreation as good, commented on the need for a daily recreation period. Their comments focused on the fitness

component of Recreation. They felt it was necessary to release stress, burn off energy and to feel good about themselves. The respondents advocated for the existing warm up activity, exercises and jogging around the gym, which they explained, was offered for the first ten or fifteen minutes of each period. In their explanations of the importance of Recreation, the respondents felt that staff did not share their opinion. They based their conclusion on their observations of staff actions of cancelling the recreation period because they did not appear to be interested in taking the cottage to the gym or as a consequence of one or two youths' misbehaviour.

According to the respondents the kind of sports that were offered could be changed. They commented that the same format has been offered for a long time and suggested that a new variety of sports be offered. The respondents suggested that residents should have some input into the daily activity and that options should be available for those who would like to do an individual activity or who are just not up to participating in the sport that day.

Mathematics

Sixty-four percent (64%) of the sample attended Mathematics. The ratings were almost evenly distributed from good to poor.

Those (39%) respondents who rated the class "good" felt that participation in this class did increase their mathematics skills and they did receive help from the

teachers. For those (28%) respondents who rated it "poor" their comments were related to the teachers' personalities.

Language Arts

Forty-six percent (46%) of the sample attended Language Arts. Eighty-five percent (85%) of them rated Language Arts as "good".

All responses by the respondents were positive regarding the teachers and the teachers' methods. The respondents commented on the use of volunteers and how the volunteers helped them read and write. They also reported on the variety of resources within the class such as books, comics, games and the computer that helped them learn and enjoy attending the class.

Lifestyles

Eight subjects (29%) attended Lifestyles. Sixty-three percent (63%) of them rated the class "good" and commented that the content was relevant. Human development, nutrition and weight training were identified by the respondents as topics that were covered by the teacher.

Three respondents (37%) rated the class poor and commented on the teachers' disciplinary approach which was to withdraw the student from the class for what the respondents described as "minor" misbehaviour.

Family Life

Ten subjects (36%) attended the Family Life Course. The majority (80%) of them rated it "good" and commented on the relevancy of the content and the teachers use of visual aids such as films, pictures and samples. A few respondents questioned the emphasis on female growth and development. They felt the teacher provided them with too much detailed information on the female reproductive system.

Adolescent Development

Forty-three percent (43%) of the sample attended Adolescent Development. The majority (75%) rated it "good" and commented positively on the relevancy of the content and the method used by the teacher. The respondents felt that the topics, e.g., suicide, baby boom, war, and human development, were interesting and the use of films helped in clarifying the material.

Communication Skills

Sixty-one percent (61%) of the sample attended Communication Skills. The majority (55%) rated the content "poor".

The respondents felt that basic communication was not fully covered. They identified activities that were conducted in the classroom, such as drawing and writing letters, and felt that these were not related to the topic. A typical response

was "I needed to learn ways to communicate with my mother and boss."

Life Skills

Seven subjects (25%) attended Life Skills. The majority (57%) rated the course "poor."

The respondents' comments focused on what they described as the teacher's lack of control of students and lack of resources. They made the suggestion that both of these points inhibited learning within the class yet the respondents felt that the topics covered were relevant.

Work Education

Eight subjects (29%) attended Work Education. Sixty-three percent (63%) of them rated it "good."

All the respondents commented that the content was relevant. They felt that they gained knowledge about work and received practical experience through a work placement.

Program Benefits and Suggestions

The sample addressed the benefits of these programs and made some suggestions of programs that should be offered that would help them within the community.

Sixty-eight percent (68%) of the sample did not think that they benefited from the programs that they participated in. They explained that these programs did not change their behaviour. Most respondents stated that once they were back in the community they still thought about crime and continued to break the law. The respondents went further and stated that nothing within the Centre, programs or staff, could change that. They felt that only they could change themselves.

These respondents identified certain things within the centre that inhibited change. They shared examples of where other residents were constantly talking about crimes and drugs and were not being supportive to each other in a positive way. Secondly, the respondents said they did not receive individual counselling by staff to help them change. They found that the counsellors did not focus on their offending thinking or behaviour, did not involve them in their case plan, and did not know how they were progressing in programs.

Thirty-two percent (32%) of the sample did think that they benefitted. They identified benefitting from the education programs as they increased their education level. Some respondents indicated that the Manitoba Youth Centre provided them with "time out" of the community. They described the Manitoba Youth Centre as a safe environment that relieved them from the pressures and stresses in the

community. Lastly, some respondents said their benefit was meeting new friends.

In comparing the re-involvement rate of these two groups one finds that those who did not think that they benefited from the programs that they participated in ninety percent (90%) were reinvolved with the law. Of those who did think that they benefited sixty-seven percent (67%) were reinvolved with the law.

Almost half the sample suggested that a transition program should be offered that helps youths move from the institution to the community. They described elements of a program where youths would leave the institution on a gradual basis to attend existing community programs such as school, work, recreation and self help meetings. They stressed that this step would have to be monitored closely for a long period of time to help youths adjust to the programs and peers. Several youths suggested involving their parents or parent in this program as opposed to Probation Officers within Community Corrections. They seemed to suggest that they would be more committed to a program if their parents were involved.

Most respondents lacked any other ideas. A few suggested programs in the following areas: aboriginal cultural education, weight training, independent living, positive peer culture and counselling.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter V will discuss the themes that arose from the interviews. It will start with the young offenders' adjustment in the community and then move on to their views of their program experiences. Lastly, it will present recommendations based on the themes that emerged.

1. COMMUNITY ADJUSTMENT

The young offenders' adjustment within the community, following their release from secure custody at the Manitoba Youth Centre in 1991, was examined in three different areas: living situation, school and work involvement and reinvolverment with the law. Within each of these areas a range of patterns were found. For example: within living situation, the youths went from no changes in their living situation to one or two changes to three or more changes. Concerning school and work involvement, the youths went from experiencing school and/or work to no involvement with either. Reinvolverment with the law was defined as being charged with an offence by the police. The youths ranged from no reinvolverment to reinvolverment with the law and living in the community to reinvolverment with the law and in a correctional facility.

The three dimensions within reinvolvement with the law will be used to discuss the young offenders' experiences in their living situation and school and work.

Only five of the young offenders (18%) released from secure custody at the Manitoba Youth Centre were not reinvolvement with the law. (Appendix G) Since being released from the Manitoba Youth Centre most of these youths changed their living situation once or twice. (Appendix H) Their changes took place amongst family members, friends' homes or to a place on their own. Only one of these youths experienced no change in his living situation. When he was released, he went to live with his father and stepmother and has been there for approximately fifteen months.

This small group of youths were involved in either school, work or combination of both. (Appendix H) Those who attended school focused on their academics. All, but one lost interest in school after approximately two months and quit. Those who experienced work were involved in maintenance type jobs such as washing cars, cleaning work sites and offices. On the average, they worked for three months and all quit except one who was laid off. Their reasons for quitting were that they were unsatisfied with their jobs and they did not like the kind of work they had to perform. At the time of the interview, the one youth who remained in school had been there for three months. The others who were out of school and work claimed they were looking for a job. They also indicated that they spent the rest of their time with family members either watching TV or visiting them.

The fact that these five youths did not get reinvolvement with the law is curious because their living situations, school and work experiences do not differ much from

the youths who were reinvolved. Concerning the demographics of these youths, there were no variables that were any different for this group than for the other two groups.

One difference noted by the writer was that this group of five mentioned ties with their family. Either they were living with family members or they revealed that they regularly visited them. Social control theorists might assume this relationship with family as an explanation on why these youths were not reinvolved with the law. They postulate that individuals are likely to turn to illegal means if their attachments to their family are weak. Unfortunately this study did not gather specific information on family relationships, e.g., family ties, parental supervision and discipline or parental role models and therefore it would be difficult to conclude from the study that this was one of the reasons why these youths did not become reinvolved with the law.

The rest of the young offenders (82%) had become reinvolved with the law since their release from secure custody at the Manitoba Youth Centre. (Appendix G) First, the report will focus on six young offenders within this group who were reinvolved with the law but remained in the community. Half of them were facing charges, such as Fail to Pay Restitution and to Appear in Court, Theft Under and Possession of Goods Obtained By Crime and were on bail. The other half appeared in court on similar type of offences, e.g., Trafficking, Theft Under and Mischief and received community dispositions or sentences such as a fine, community service work or probation supervision. Upon release from the Manitoba Youth Centre, these

six youths started off by living with family members such as their mothers, fathers or both. These situations only lasted for two youths whereas the others ended up living on their own or with friends. All but one of them spent a night or two "locked up" in a correctional facility, as a result of their reinvolvement with the law. One would suspect that when these youths were picked up by the police they would automatically be detained because of their young offender record. The other one spent three months in a psychiatric ward of a local hospital. By his own account this was because of mental health problems. (Appendix H)

This unsettled pattern continued in these youths' school and work experiences. (Appendix H) The youths who attended school each had a couple of short attempts at classes or programs within the school system. They all dropped out and most of them went on to try work. Their experiences in the employment area were not much different. Most of them experienced two jobs with the most common being sales and fast food work. They lasted in these jobs for approximately one month and then quit, claiming that they were unsatisfied with their wages and the kind of work expected of them. Three of these youths returned to school and remained in school at the time of the interview. The others indicated that they were spending most of their time with their girlfriends or with friends in activities such as partying, hanging out at pool halls, walking around and going to bars.

The fact that these youths remained in the community, despite reinvolvement with the law, may be because they lived with their families or they continued with school. Even though these experiences did not deter them from reinvolvement with

the law they may have presented an image of "community adjustment" to the Justice System. One can speculate that these youths remained in the community because of the appearance of their legitimate activities such as living with their family or attending school.

The last group of young offenders, seventeen in total, were reinvolved with the law and returned to custody. (Appendix G) They were involved in anywhere from two to thirty offences each. The most common offence were property offences such as Break and Enter, Theft and Possession of Goods Obtained By Crime. The offences occurred within the young offenders' first year of being released from the Manitoba Youth Centre and most of them occurred within the first 6 months. Some of these youths were in remand or secure custody in the Manitoba Youth Centre. Whereas the others were in an adult correctional facility such as the Winnipeg Remand Centre, Headingly Correctional Institution or a Halfway House connected with Stoney Mountain Penitentiary, Correctional Services of Canada. Those in the Adult Justice System were there either because they were reinvolved with the law when they were eighteen years of age or they were raised to adult court. The change to adult court could be due to the severity of their offense(s) or all the resources within the Youth Justice System were deemed exhausted by the Judge. For example, the subject sentenced to Stoney Mountain Penitentiary claimed to have committed thirty Break and Enters.

While serving their new sentences some of these youths were reinvolved with the law, escaped custody or did not return from a temporary absence. This typically led to a charge with a return to custody or additional time in custody.

When released to the community in 1991, these youths had either gone directly back to custody or went from living with a family member to a combination of living with other family members, friends, alone and the streets. (Appendix H)

All but five experienced either school or work. (Appendix H) Their involvements were short lived. One was fired from his job and one was picked up by the police which resulted in him losing his job. All others quit their school or work involvement. Their reasons for quitting were that they had problems adjusting to school, a training program or a job. They revealed that they had difficulties getting along with people in those situations and adhering to their rules and expectations. When these youths were not involved in either school or work they reported that they spent their time in what they described as criminal activities and partying with alcohol and drugs.

For the most part, it appeared that the community adjustment of the sample, following their release from secure custody, was less than ideal. Most of them lived in several different places, were involved in school or work for short periods of time and were reinvolved with the law.

These findings are consistent with the literature review where Ross and Fabiano (1981) and Grissom and Dubnov (1989) found that correctional programs that did not help the offenders adjust in the community did not include a number of components

that had been demonstrated to help. These components are listed in the literature review (Chapter II). There was little evidence from the youths' interviews that these components were in existence at the Manitoba Youth Centre. For example, theory based programs, involvement of family and the community, positive role models and peer support for positive attitudes and behaviours do not appear to be emphasized throughout secure custody at the Manitoba Youth Centre and therefore could be a reason for the results of the study. ...

Next the results of comparing the young offenders' demographics to their adjustment in the community will be discussed. The variables such as age, ethnic origin, education level, child abuse disclosure, substance abuse disclosure, wardship, contact with natural father, offence(s) committed to secure custody, lengths of time in secure custody and prior involvement with Community and Youth Corrections were compared with the youths' experiences in their living situation, school and/or work and their involvement with the law. Some of these variables appeared related in some ways with the young offenders' community adjustment and will be discussed below.

1. Child Abuse Disclosure

In reviewing the files, three youths disclosed that they had been victims of child abuse. The abuse was identified as physical abuse in two cases and sexual abuse in the other case. Even though it is a small number of youths, they all experienced difficulties adjusting in the community. They had changes to their living situation, quit both school and work and were reinvolved with the law.

In comparison to the group who did not disclose that they had been victims of child abuse 100% were reinvolved with the law compared to 80%, 100% were not involved with school or work at the time of the interview compared to 84% and 100% had more than one change to their living situation compared to 88%.
(Table 12)

TABLE 12. CHILD ABUSE DISCLOSURE

VARIABLE	REINVOLVEMENT WITH THE LAW				SCHOOL AND WORK INVOLVEMENT							LIVING SITUATION		
	NO RE-INVOLVEMENT	REINVOLVED & IN COMMUNITY	REINVOLVED & IN CUSTODY		SCHOOL	SCHOOL/WORK & RETURNED TO SCHOOL	SCHOOL & QUIT	WORK & QUIT	SCHOOL / WORK & QUIT	NO IN-VOLVEMENT		0 CHANGES	1 & 2 CHANGES	3+ CHANGES
YES (3)	0	0	3	(3)	0	0	1	2	0	0	(3)	0	3	0
NO (25)	5	6	14	(25)	1	3	6	5	5	5	(25)	3	15	7
TOTAL (28)	5	6	17	(28)	1	3	7	7	5	5	(28)	3	18	7

2. Contact with Natural Father

Only six youths continued to have some type of involvement with their natural fathers. The rest were from situations where their contacts with their fathers were non-existent or rare. Those youths who had contact with their natural fathers did not appear to adjust in school or work any better than the others. For example, 100% were not involved with school or work at the time of the interview compared to 82% of those who had no contact with their natural father. (Table 13) Some of the most recent literature, such as Corneau's (1991) work on the impact of father/son relationships, concluded that absent fathers could result in males having trouble in relationships, the law and substance abuse. The finding in this study goes against this literature as these problems were similar with both groups of youths.

TABLE 13. CONTACT WITH NATURAL FATHER

VARIABLE	REINVOLVEMENT WITH THE LAW				SCHOOL AND WORK INVOLVEMENT							LIVING SITUATION		
	NO RE-INVOLVEMENT	REINVOLVED & IN COMMUNITY	REINVOLVED & IN CUSTODY		SCHOOL	SCHOOL/WORK & RETURNED TO SCHOOL	SCHOOL & QUIT	WORK & QUIT	SCHOOL / WORK & QUIT	NO INVOLVEMENT		0 CHANGES	1 & 2 CHANGES	3+ CHANGES
CONTACT WITH NATURAL FATHER														
YES (6)	1	2	3	(6)	0	0	2	1	2	1	(6)	3	2	1
NO (22)	4	4	14	(22)	1	3	5	6	3	4	(22)	0	16	6
TOTAL (28)	5	6	17	(28)	1	3	7	7	5	5	(28)	3	18	7

3. Prior Involvement

Three youths had no prior involvements with the law. In examining their files it appeared that the three of them were committed on eight offences each and most were property offences. One subject had a sexual assault and another had several Fail to Appear in Court charges. The other subject had eight Break and Enters which happened all during the same period of time and were described as "sophisticated" in the pre-disposition report. These youths experienced difficulties in adjusting in the community. In comparison to those who had prior offenses, 100% were involved with the law compared to 80%, 100% were not involved in school or work at the time of the interview compared with 84% and 100% had more than one change to their living situation compared to 88%. (Table 14) One could conclude that these youths' first experience in custody did not deter them from further reinvolverment with the law. This is consistent with Astone's (1982) research finding which suggested that custody was not a deterrent but a major cause of recidivism.

VARIABLE	REINVOLVEMENT WITH THE LAW				SCHOOL AND WORK INVOLVEMENT							LIVING SITUATION		
	NO RE-INVOLVEMENT	REINVOLVED & IN COMMUNITY	REINVOLVED & IN CUSTODY		SCHOOL	SCHOOL/WORK & RETURNED TO SCHOOL	SCHOOL & QUIT	WORK & QUIT	SCHOOL / WORK & QUIT	NO INVOLVEMENT		0 CHANGES	1 & 2 CHANGES	3+ CHANGES
PROPERTY PLUS OTHER (U.A.L., E.L.C., F.T.C.P.O., FAIL TO APPEAR)	1	3	4	(8)	1	1	4	1	0	1	(8)	2	5	1
PROPERTY PLUS ASSAULTS (A.C.B.H., SEXUAL ASSAULT)	0	2	3	(5)	0	1	1	2	1	0	(5)	0	4	1
PROPERTY (B. & E., THEFT, P.G.O.B.C.)	2	0	1	(3)	0	0	0	1	1	1	(3)	1	1	1
COMBINATION OF ALL ABOVE OFFENCE	0	0	1	(1)	0	0	0	0	0	1	(1)	0	0	1
PROPERTY PLUS POSSESSION OF NARCOTICS	2	1	0	(3)	0	1	0	0	2	0	(3)	0	3	0
ABOVE PLUS OTHER (U.A.L., E.L.C., F.T.C.P.O., FAIL TO APPEAR)	0	0	3	(3)	0	0	1	2	0	0	(3)	0	1	2
NIL	0	0	3	(3)	0	0	1	0	0	2	(3)	0	2	1
ASSAULT	0	0	1	(1)	0	0	0	1	0	0	(1)	0	1	0
POSSESSION OF NARCOTICS	0	0	1	(1)	0	0	0	0	1	0	(1)	0	1	0
TOTAL (28)	5	6	17	(28)	1	3	7	7	5	5	(28)	3	18	7

4. Length of Time in Secure Custody

In reviewing the files, six youths who were in custody for eight months or more did not adjust in school or work any more than the others. For example, 100% were not in school or work at the time of the interview in comparison to 82% of the other group who were in custody from 3 to 7 months. (Table 15) This raises the question about how long of a time period should youths be removed from the community if it makes it harder for them to integrate back?

TABLE 15. LENGTH OF TIME IN SECURE CUSTODY

VARIABLE	REINVOLVEMENT WITH THE LAW				SCHOOL AND WORK INVOLVEMENT							LIVING SITUATION		
	NO RE-INVOLVEMENT	REINVOLVED & IN COMMUNITY	REINVOLVED & IN CUSTODY		SCHOOL	SCHOOL/WORK & RETURNED TO SCHOOL	SCHOOL & QUIT	WORK & QUIT	SCHOOL / WORK & QUIT	NO INVOLVEMENT		0 CHANGES	1 & 2 CHANGES	3+ CHANGES
3 MONTHS	1	1	6	(8)	1	0	0	3	3	1	(8)	1	5	2
4 MONTHS	0	1	4	(5)	0	1	1	0	0	3	(5)	0	3	2
5 MONTHS	0	1	2	(3)	0	1	2	0	0	0	(3)	0	3	0
6 MONTHS	2	0	0	(2)	0	0	0	0	2	0	(2)	1	1	0
7 MONTHS	0	2	2	(4)	0	1	2	0	0	1	(4)	1	1	2
8 MONTHS	0	0	1	(1)	0	0	1	0	0	0	(1)	0	1	0
12 MONTHS	1	0	0	(1)	0	0	0	1	0	0	(1)	0	1	0
13 MONTHS	1	0	1	(2)	0	0	1	1	0	0	(2)	0	1	1
14 MONTHS	0	0	1	(1)	0	0	0	1	0	0	(1)	0	1	0
28 MONTHS	0	1	0	(1)	0	0	0	1	0	0	(1)	0	1	0
TOTAL (28)	5	6	17	(28)	1	3	7	7	5	5	(28)	3	18	7

2. VIEWS OF PROGRAM EXPERIENCES

This next section will discuss the young offenders' views of their program experiences within the Manitoba Youth Centre.

Most of the programs experienced by the youths were viewed as favourable. All of the youths experienced the Recreation Program and most of them experienced the Resident Employment and Religious Education Programs. The youths revealed that these programs helped them cope with their secure custody disposition. They described their cottages (living units) as confining and restricting and participating in these programs provided a break for them from that environment. For example, in the Recreation Program, the respondents indicated that they were able to run around the gym and "blow off steam." In both the Resident Employment and Religious Education Programs they indicated that they were able to socialize with other residents. Within the Resident Employment Program the youths earned money for working. They informed the writer that this enabled them to purchase articles that were not provided by the institution such as cigarettes, soft drinks and candy.

The youths did not mention anything about developing skills within these programs. This was probably secondary for the youths. It appeared that this was secondary for the staff within the Resident Employment Program as well. On the basis of the youths' responses, the emphasis in the work sites, especially in the cafeteria, was on getting the job done as opposed to instructing the youths on how to do the job.

When one looks at the objectives of these three programs, Recreation, Resident Employment and Religious Education, reference to the learning of new skills is mentioned but the transferring of skills to the community is neglected. The writer found little connection of these programs to one of the goals of the Manitoba Youth Centre which is the reintegration of young offenders to the community.

Concerning the Social Thinking Skills and Sexual Offender Programs the youths said that they learned and practised new skills within these programs. These experiences would suggest that these programs were meeting their program objectives. The only gaps that were identified by the youths were in the maintenance of these new skills. They referred to little connection from these programs to their cottages. On the basis of their responses, it would appear that cottage staff were not assisting them in maintaining these newly acquired skills. It was also mentioned by the youths that their parent(s), Social Worker and/or Probation Officer were not aware of their progress in these programs and therefore could not reinforce them.

According to the respondents, the Substance Abuse Intervention Program did not provide intervention and the focus of the program was educational. They indicated that they gained some information on substances but did not learn any alternatives to their abuse of substances. A lot of the youths expressed disappointment and felt that they needed assistance in the substance abuse area. This is consistent with the demographic variable that indicated that 71% of the youths disclosed involvement with substances.

Concerning the Academic Education Programs taught by the teachers the youths thought that the subjects were relevant. They felt they increased their knowledge and learned some new skills in most subjects. Two exceptions, noted by the youths, were Communication Skills and Life Skills. Those who attended Communication Skills said that they could not make a connection with the activities that were conducted in the classroom and the topic "communication." Those who attended Life Skills felt that the teachers lack of control and resources inhibited the work to be done.

The youths viewed the teachers' methods as very important. They praised those teachers who they thought put a lot of effort into the topic by using a variety of methods, e.g., films, discussions and samples, within the classroom. The youths seemed to feel that this technique helped them learn and also determined how youths behaved within the classroom.

In the literature review and in the study the youths offered few program suggestions. The idea that did emerge the most in both was a transition program from the institution to the community.

The young offenders perceived no benefits from their program experiences towards their adjustment in the community. These findings were not consistent with the literature review as in most of the studies the offenders responded positively to this question. The caution here is the question. In reviewing the studies the question regarding benefits was asked in many different ways and was not always asked specifically in relation to community adjustment. One study which was

conducted by Hunt and Hoffman (1975) was consistent with this study as it received similar comments from the respondents which were that programs of any kind were not helpful and that people can only help themselves when they are ready. The only benefits mentioned by the youths were that certain programs, e.g., Recreation, Resident Employment Program and Religious Education Program, made their time in secure custody easier to cope and the Academic Education Programs increased their education level. The respondents added that if they were in the community they probably would not have been attending school. Therefore, their time in custody provided them with the opportunity to increase their education level.

In examining the data, no program patterns were found for those youths who had no change in their living situation, maintained involvement in school and abided by the law. They each took anywhere from two to ten programs and the only program that was common amongst them was Recreation. (Appendix I) As stated before, Recreation was a cottage program and mandatory for all residents.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS

The fact that the young offenders did not perceive that the programs at the Manitoba Youth Centre assisted them in adjusting in the community raises concern. It appeared that secure custody at the Manitoba Youth Centre increased the youths' education level, gave them "time out" from the community and taught them some

skills. Some of the skills that the youths did learn were not applied or reinforced in other areas of the institution. Therefore, it would appear that when the youths returned to the community they returned to their previous behaviour and continued to have difficulties in their living situation, with school and work and abiding by the law.

Because one of the Manitoba Youth Centres' goals is the reintegration of young offenders into their communities it is suggested that secure custody at the Manitoba Youth Centre develop a conceptual framework consistent with their policy statement. This framework could be based on theories. These theories state the problems that lead to the youth's illegal behaviour and point to intervention strategies. Intervention strategies consist of programs and services that address the skills necessary for the youths to reintegrate into the community. Cullen and Gendreau (1989) have concluded that correctional programs which appear to be effective are based on theory and a specific intervention. Specific intervention strategies were identified in the literature review. (Chapter 2) Martin, Sechrest, and Redner (1981) support Cullen & Gendreau. They believe that a framework provides a sound base for programs as opposed to adopting a fad which they claim is often done in Corrections.

There are a variety of theories and intervention strategies that the Manitoba Youth Centre could consider. What follows is a description of one of those intervention strategies. The writer would suggest that the Manitoba Youth Centre consider Relapse Prevention. Cullen & Gendreau (1989) listed relapse prevention as

one of the intervention strategies that helped the offenders adjust in the community. In addition relapse prevention can address some of the specific issues that arose from the interviews.

In 1985, Marlatt and Gordon published one of the first texts on Relapse Prevention for the treatment of addictive disorders. Since then, this intervention strategy has been extended and applied to a variety of problem areas. Relapse Prevention is a self management approach in which the goal is "to teach individuals who are trying to change their behaviour how to anticipate and cope with problems of relapse" (Marlatt and Gordon (1985) p.3). It is based on social learning theory. Social learning theorists believe that anti-social behaviours develop through observation, imitation and reinforced practice and that anti-social behaviours need to be extinguished and pro-social actions need to be reinforced.

Briefly, Relapse Prevention includes three stages. The first stage involves motivation and commitment to change. Individuals, who are working on changing their behaviour, actively participate in the process and become responsible for changing their behaviour. Marlatt and Gordon (1985) teach the individuals to become the agent of change.

The second stage is the implementation of the programs. The programs offered teach the individuals behavioural skills, cognitive strategies and lifestyles changes. This stage is based on Goldstein's Structured Learning Procedures described in Goldstein, Sprafken, Gershaw & Klein's book Skill-Streaming The Adolescent (1980) where the individuals are taught skills, practice skills and are provided with positive

feedback and opportunities to apply newly learned behaviour.

In the literature review reference was made to Romig (1979) regarding programs that he claims helps the young offenders adjust in the community. Romig (1979) also identifies teaching the youths' skills and the teaching model that he describes consists of those methods as well.

The third stage is maintenance. The individual works to maintain the commitment to the change over time. Marlatt and Gordon (1985) teach the individuals that setbacks or what they have termed "lapses" are not failures but mistakes and are opportunities for new learning and personal growth.

Based on the results of the study relapse prevention could teach the youths skills and help them apply these skills in other parts of the institution and eventually in the community. Secondly, it involves the youths in making a commitment in personal change and growth.

The following recommendations focus on what would need to be considered by the Manitoba Youth Centre in order to adapt an intervention strategy like Relapse Prevention. The implementation of Relapse Prevention assumes that adoption of a conceptual framework, consistent with the Manitoba Youth Centre policy, has taken place.

1. Programs

The Manitoba Youth Centre would have to examine the purposes of their existing programs to ensure that they are consistent with their theoretical statements. Some programs may have to be eliminated and new ones developed. Programs need to be offered that help youths function in the community and that teach pro-social ways of coping. Some existing programs at the Manitoba Youth Centre such as Social Thinking Skills and Sexual Offender Program appear to have this focus.

Program implementation would need to be reviewed and the Structured Learning approach, where skills are taught to the youths and modelling, role playing and performance feedback occurs, would need to be incorporated. Once again, Social Thinking Skills appears to be applying some of these techniques in their programs.

The Communication class may need to be examined closely to investigate its purpose and approach. There appears to be evidence, both in the literature review and the youths' views, that this is an important topic.

2. Maintenance

The Manitoba Youth Centre would have to integrate programs to each other, to the cottages and to the community. The youths would learn skills in one program and be expected to apply them in all areas of the institution with staff

providing feedback. For example, skills learned and practised in Social Thinking Skills could be applied and reinforced in the Resident Employment Program, Recreation and in the youths' cottage. Skills learned in Resident Employment Program could be reinforced in the Work Education Program.

As observed in this follow up study, the Manitoba Youth Centre's experiences do not appear sufficient in preparing the youths to cope within the environment to which they return. Therefore, the Manitoba Youth Centre needs to link their programs to the youths' significant others within the community, e.g., family, relatives, friends, Social Workers, and Probation Officers. Community assessments must be conducted to ensure that these connections with family, relatives and friends are positive and constructive. Following a review of dozens of non-experimental studies, Genevie, Margolies, and Muhlin (1986) found that "juveniles who are released with no support after serving maximum sentences were associated with higher risks of recidivism than juveniles receiving any form of support after release" (P. 55).

In addition, the Manitoba Youth Centre and Community Corrections should work closer together to strengthen links from institution programs such as Substance Abuse Intervention, Religious Education, Recreation, Education including Work Education with established programs and organizations within the community. For some youths links with cultural specific programs would be important. These programs and organizations could provide supervision, support and encouragement that these youths need to adjust in the community.

In their review of correctional programs Gendreau and Ross (1979) noted the importance of providing for a continuum of intervention with the cooperation and support of the community programs and organizations.

3. Resident Involvement

The Manitoba Youth Centre would need to involve the residents and their parent(s) or Social Worker in their case plan meeting and review. These meetings typically consist of the youth's Counsellor and Probation Officer identifying his needs and assigning responsibility for action. More detail of these meetings may be found in the Introduction (Chapter I). The notion that youths should participate and take responsibility for their plan and the inclusion of significant others for support is an integral component of Relapse Prevention. In the interviews, many youths indicated that they were involved minimally in identifying their plan and they also expressed a lack of motivation to change. Marlatt and Gordon (1985) address motivation and commitment to change. "Those of us in the treatment field need to pay greater attention to the motivation and commitment stage of change in order to improve the readiness of clients to embark upon a specific program of change" (p. 22). The Manitoba Youth Centre's staff would need to apply methods in assisting youths in wanting to change themselves. Privileges, such as Temporary Absences (T.A.'s) could be used to motivate youths to actively participate in institution programs.

If this intervention strategy (Relapse Prevention) or any other is to be

adapted consideration would be needed to be given to staff training and program evaluation. These two items will be discussed below.

The Manitoba Youth Centre would have to train all staff within the institution so that they understand the conceptual framework and the Relapse Prevention concepts and are able to implement them. Ross and Fabiano (1979) and Grissom and Dubnov (1989) found that the counsellor needs to act as a pro-social model and reinforce pro-social attitudes, cognitive and behavioural patterns. This approach may also alleviate some of the negative peer atmosphere described in some of the follow-up interviews.

The Manitoba Youth Centre would need to develop evaluation strategies. Martin, Sechrest and Redner (1981) recommended one approach. They also suggested that the intervention strategy and the evaluation strategy be developed at the same point in time. Therefore, the Manitoba Youth Centre's Program Facilitators and Coordinator could work together to determine how they would measure the objectives, assess the implementation and determine the outcomes of each program.

In conclusion the Manitoba Youth Centre does not appear to be providing custody programs for the reintegration of the young offenders into their communities. This conclusion is based not only on the youths' community experiences following their release from secure custody but it is also based on their views and perceptions. The recommendations that are offered are based on the research that has been demonstrated to help young offenders adjust in

the community. A conceptual framework can help the Manitoba Youth Centre determine which problems of the youths in secure custody they need to focus on which will help the youths adjust in the community. Secondly, it will help identify the intervention strategies (programs and services). Relapse prevention is one intervention strategy that can address some of the difficulties that the youths experienced in adjusting to the community.

It is now left with the Manitoba Youth Centre to learn from these results and to apply these recommendations in the hope of helping the young offenders reintegrate into their communities.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allerhand, M., Weber, R., and Polansky, N. (1961). The Bellefaire Follow-Up Study: Research Objectives and Methods. Child Welfare, September, 7-13.

Anderson, D. (1982). The Relationship Between Correctional Education and Parole Success. Journal of Offender Counselling, Services and Rehabilitation, 5(3/4), 13-25.

Astone, N. (1982). What helps rehabilitation? A survey of research findings. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 26(2), 109-120.

Ayers, D. (1981). Proceedings of the National Conference on Prison Education. Victoria, B.C. British Columbia: University of Victoria.

Babbie, E. (1986). The Practice of Social Research. California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc.

Barton, S. and Sarri, R. (1976). Where are they now? A follow-up study of youths in juvenile correction programs. Michigan: University of Michigan.

Benda, B. (1987). Comparison of Rate of Recidivism among Status Offenders and Delinquents. Adolescence, XXII(86), 445-458.

Birkenmayer, A. and Polonoski, M. (1975). The Community Adjustment of Male Training School Recidivists: 1. The Follow-up Interview. Ontario: Ministry of Correctional Services.

Buttram, J. and Dusewicz, R. (1977). Effectiveness of educational programs in state correction institutions: a follow-up study of ex-offenders. Pennsylvania: Research for Better Schools Inc.

Corneau, G. (1991). Absent Father's, Lost Sons: The Search for Masculine Identity. Shambala.

Corsini, R. and Bartleme, K. (1953). Penology and the Attitude of Prisoners. British Journal of Delinquency, 4(1), 55-58.

Cullen, F. and Gendreau, P. (1989). The Effectiveness of Correctional Rehabilitation. In L. Goodstein & D. L. MacKenzie (eds.), The American Prison: Issues in Research Policy (p.23). New York: Plenum.

Dubnov, W. (1986). The Glen Mills Project: Innovation in Juvenile Corrections. Journal of Offender Counselling, Services and Rehabilitation, 10(4), 87-105.

Duguid, S. (1990). Yearbook of Correctional Education. British Columbia: Simon Fraser University.

Gendreau, P. and Andrews, D. (1989). What the Meta - Analysis of the Offender Treatment Literature tells us about "What Works". Laboratory for Research on Assessment and Evaluation in the Human Services, Department of Psychology, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario.

Gendreau, P. and Leipziger, M. (1978). The Development of a Recidivism Measure and its Application in Ontario. Canadian Journal of Criminology, 20(1), 3-17.

Gendreau, P. and Ross, R. (1979). Effective Correctional Treatment: Bibliotherapy for Cynics. Crime and Delinquency, 25, 463 - 489.

Genevie, L., Margolies, E., and Muhlin, G. (1986). How Effective Is Correctional Intervention? Social Policy, 17, 52-57.

- Goldstein, A., Sprafkin, R., Gershaw, N., and Klein, P. (1980). Skill Streaming The Adolescent. Illinois: Research Press Company.

Goodstein, L. and MacKenzie, D. (1989). The American Prison: Issues in Research Policy. New York: Plenum.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS: Manitoba Youth Centre (Community & Youth Correctional Services) Role & Mission Statement. January, 1986.

Greenberg, D. (1977). Corrections and Punishment. California: Sage Publications, Inc.

Grissom, G. and Dubnov, W. (1989). Without Locks and Bars. Connecticut: Praeger Publishers.

Hunt, J. and Hoffman, D. (1975). The Effects and Outcome of Institutionalization Upon Juveniles. Iowa Department of Social Services.

Jenkins, M. (1990). Evaluation of Correctional Education Programs. In Duguid, S. (ed.), Yearbook of Correctional Education 1990 (p.139). British Columbia: Simon Fraser University.

Johnson, H., Ramsay, R., Nutter, C., Ferguson, G., and Sisk, B., (1974). Mapleridge Follow-Up Study. Edmonton, Alberta.

Lab, S. and Whitehead, J. (1988). An analysis of Juvenile Correctional Treatment. Crime and Delinquency, 34(1), 60-83.

Laulicht, J. (1962). A Study of Recidivism in One Training School. Crime and Delinquency, 8, 161-171.

Lipton, D., Martinson, R., and Wilks, J., (1975). The Effectiveness of Correctional Treatment: A Survey of Treatment Evaluation Studies. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Luna, G. and Price, T. (1992). Qualitative Research: A New Approach for the Correctional Education Teacher as Researcher. Journal of Correctional Education, 43(3), 118-122.

- Marlatt, G. and Gordon, J. (1985). Relapse Prevention. New York: The Guilford Press.

+ Martin, S., Sechrest, L., and Redner, R. (1981). New Directions in the Rehabilitation of Criminal Offenders. Washington, D. C.: National Academy Press.

Martinson, R. (1974). What Works? Questions and answers about prison reform. The Public Interest, Spring, 22-54.

Maskin, M. (1976). The Differential of Work - Oriented VS. Communication - Oriented Juvenile Corrections Programs upon Recidivism Rates in Delinquent Males. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 32, 432 - 433.

Morin, L. (1981). On Prison Education. Ontario: Minister of Supply and Services.

- Novotny, C. and Burstein, M. (1974). Adjustment of Delinquent Boys after Release from a Juvenile Corrective Institute. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 3(1), 49-60.

Palmer, T. (1975). Martinson revisited. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 12, 22-54.

Parlett, T. (1981). The Benefits of Advanced Education in Prisons. In Moran, L. (ed.), On Prison Education (p.106). Ontario: Minister of Supplies and Services.

- Reckless, W. (1955). The Impact of Correctional Programs on Inmates. British Journal of Delinquency, 6, 138-147.

- Reppucci, D. and Clingempeel, G. (1978). Methodological Issues in Research with Correctional Populations. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 46(4), 727-746.

- Roberts, A. R. (1973). Readings in Prison Education. Illinois: Charles C. Thomas.

- Robison, J. and Smith, G. (1971). The Effectiveness of Correctional Programs. Crime and Delinquency, January, 67-80.

- Romig, D. (1978). Justice for our children. Massachusetts: D. C. Heath and Company.

- Ross, R. and Gendreau, P. (1980). Effective Correctional Treatment. Ontario: Butterworth and Company Ltd.

- Ross, R. (1981). Prison Programming Evaluation. In Ayers, D. (ed.), Proceedings of the National Conference on Prison Education, Victoria, B.C. (p.177). British Columbia: University of Victoria.

- Ross, R. and Fabiano, E. (1981). Time To Think. Ottawa: University of Ottawa, Department of Criminology.

- Sabnis, M. (1951). "A Measure of Impact of Institutional Experience on Inmates of a Training School." Cited In Reckless, W. (1955). The Impact on Correctional Programs on Inmates (p.140). British Journal of Delinquency.

- Seashore, M. and Haberfeld, S. (1976). Prisoner Education. New York: Praeger Publishers, Inc.

- Simpson, J., Eynon, T., and Reckless, W. (1961). Institutionalization As Perceived by the Juvenile Offender. Sociology and Social Research, August, 13-23.

- Traynelis - Yurek, E. and Giacobbe, G. (1988). Length of Stay and Age affect Recidivism after a Quality Treatment Program. International Journal of Adolescence and Youth, 1, 257 - 267.

- Vito, G. (1982). Does It Work? Problems in the Evaluation of a Correctional Treatment Program. Journal of Offender Counselling, Services and Rehabilitation, 7 (1), 5-21.

- Waldo, G. (1973). Research in Correctional Education. In Roberts, A. R. (ed.), Readings in Prison Education (p.364). Illinois: Charles C. Thomas.
- Webb, L. and Scanlon, J. (1981). The Effectiveness of Institutional and Community Based Programs for Juvenile Offenders. Juvenile and Family Court Journal, August, 11-16.
- Whitehead, J. and Lab, S. (1989). A Meta-Analysis of Juvenile Correctional Treatment. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 26(3), 276-295.
- Wilson, P. (1992). Principles and Practice of Relapse Prevention. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Zibners, H. (1954). The Influence of Short-Term Institutionalization upon Emotionally Disturbed and Delinquent Children. Cited in Reckless, W. (1955). The Impact on Correctional Programs on Inmates (p.143). British Journal of Delinquency.

APPENDIX A:
MANITOBA YOUTH CENTRE'S POLICY & PROCEDURES

POLICY AND PROCEDURES MANUAL

Section: 1 Sub-Section: 1

Item: 2

MANITOBA YOUTH CENTRE

Page: 1

Date of Issue: October 10, 1984

MISSIONM

Date of Revision: January, 1986

Subject: Administration - Role and Mission Statement

Manitoba Youth Centre

MANITOBA YOUTH CENTRE
COMMUNITY AND YOUTH CORRECTIONAL SERVICES
ROLE AND MISSION STATEMENT

The Manitoba Youth Centre, as part of Community and Youth Correctional Services, has as its main goals, the following:

- * the protection of society,
- * the reintegration of young offenders into their communities,
- * the opportunity for young offenders to participate in awareness programs,
- * the development of meaningful relationships with communities.

These goals are accomplished by:

- * supervising young offenders in appropriate social control programs in the community,
- * developing and providing custody programs appropriate for the protection of society and the reintegration of the young offender,
- * developing and providing awareness programs for young offenders to be able to make appropriate choices that affect their lives.

Subject: Administration - Role and Mission Statement

Manitoba Youth Centre

The Manitoba Youth Centre, in the delivery of its programs and services, is committed to the following principles:

- * the rights of communities for safety and protection,
- * the right of young offenders to receive adequate and appropriate care, custody and programming,
- * the rights and responsibilities of the individuals,
- * constructive assistance to the offender,
- * accountability of the service network.

APPENDIX B:
FILE INFORMATION FORM

CODE NUMBER: _____

FILE INFORMATION FORM:
(DEMOGRAPHICS)

DATE: _____

DISCHARGE DATE: _____

ADMISSION DATE: _____

ADDRESS: _____

PHONE NUMBER: _____

NAME: _____

SEX: _____ BIRTH DATE: _____ AGE: _____

ETHNIC ORIGIN: _____

WARDSHIP STATUS: NON-WARD: _____ WARD: _____

AGENCY: _____

PROBATION OFFICER: _____

LAWYER: _____

EDUCATION LEVEL: _____

OFFENSE AND DISPOSITION:

PRIOR OFFENSES	DISPOSITION

SOCIAL THINKING SKILLS	
SUBSTANCE ABUSE INTERVENTION	
ACADEMIC EDUCATION	
SEXUAL OFFENDER PROGRAM	
RESIDENT EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM	
RELIGIOUS EDUCATION PROGRAM	
RECREATION	
ABUSE DISCLOSURE	
SUBSTANCE ABUSE	

DATE CONTACTED C.Y.C. RECORDS: _____

NEW ADDRESS/PHONE #: _____

DATE LETTER SENT: _____

DATE PHONED: _____

PARENTAL CONSENT: _____

INTERVIEW DATE: _____

N.B. SEPT. 19/92

APPENDIX C:

LETTER TO FORMER MANITOBA YOUTH CENTRE RESIDENTS

September 12, 1992

NAME
ADDRESS
ADDRESS

HI

A FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF YOUTH RELEASED FROM THE MANITOBA YOUTH CENTRE.


I'm a student with the University of Manitoba studying the Manitoba Youth Centre (M.Y.C.) and need to talk with youth who spent time in M.Y.C. in 1991. I am trying to answer the following questions:

- * What are your experiences since your release from the Manitoba Youth Centre?
- * Have the programs that you participated in at the Manitoba Youth Centre been helpful to you?
- * What type of programs would help you and other youth within the community?

You were chosen to provide information about your experiences with the Manitoba Youth Centre. Your answers can help make the Manitoba Youth Centre's programs better for youth.

I would like to meet you and ask you questions about your experiences since release. I will also ask you for comments and suggestions on the Manitoba Youth Centre's programs. You may refuse to answer any questions. All information will be kept confidential.

I will contact you soon to set a meeting. The meeting will take one half hour and will be held at a time and place most suitable to you.

If you have any questions you may call me at 

Thanks.

Nancy Barkwell

APPENDIX D:
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

CODE NUMBER: _____

INTERVIEW FORM:

These questions will be read to the subject. To ensure that he/she understands each question and that his/her response is clear clarifying questions will be asked. The subject will be reminded that he/she may decline to answer any question. Before starting review the study and ask if the subject has any questions.

LIVING SITUATION:

1. WHERE DID YOU GO TO LIVE WHEN YOU WERE RELEASED FROM THE MANITOBA YOUTH CENTRE?

A) ONE OR BOTH PARENTS

B) GRANDPARENTS

C) BROTHER OR SISTER

D) OTHER RELATIVE

E) ALONE

F) OTHER (SPOUSE, COMMON LAW, FRIENDS, FOSTER PARENTS)

G) INSTITUTION

H) GROUP HOME

2. HOW LONG WERE YOU THERE? _____

3. HOW MANY DIFFERENT HOMES HAVE YOU BEEN IN SINCE THEN? (I.E. HOW MANY, WHAT TYPES, CHRONOLOGICAL SEQUENCE OF LIVING PLACES)

4. WHERE ARE YOU LIVING NOW? _____

EDUCATION

5. HAVE YOU ATTENDED SCHOOL OR TAKEN ANY CLASSES OR TRAINING AT ANY TIME SINCE LEAVING M.Y.C? _____

6. IF YES, WHAT?
SCHOOL

COURSE/PROGRAM

P E R I O D O F
SCHOOLING

7. IF EDUCATION WAS NOT CONTINUED WHAT WAS THE REASON?

- A) LACK OF INTEREST
- B) FINANCIAL DIFFICULTIES
- C) FAMILY CONSIDERATIONS
- D) PROBLEMS OF ADJUSTING TO SCHOOL
- E) OTHER _____

EMPLOYMENT

8. HAVE YOU WORKED SINCE LEAVING M.Y.C.? _____

9. IF YES, WHAT JOB(S) HAVE YOU HAD SINCE RELEASE? (FULL OR PART TIME)

TYPE OF JOB

LOCATION

PERIOD OF EMPLOYMENT

10. IF EMPLOYMENT WAS TERMINATED WHAT WAS THE REASON? _____

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

11. DO YOU PARTICIPATE IN ANY ORGANIZED COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES? ____

12. IF YES, WHAT KINDS OF ACTIVITY?

A) YOUTH ACTIVITY GROUP

B) RELIGIOUS

C) CULTURAL

D) VOLUNTEER

E) OTHER _____

13. IN A TYPICAL WEEK, HOW MANY HOURS DO YOU SPEND:

A) READING _____

B) WATCHING T.V. _____

C) PLAYING SPORTS _____

D) HOBBIES _____

E) DRINKING _____

14. WHAT ELSE DO YOU DO WITH YOUR TIME? _____

REINVOLVEMENT WITH THE LAW

15. HAVE YOU COME INTO CONTACT WITH THE POLICE SINCE YOUR
RELEASE? _____

IF YES, WHY? _____

16. IF YES, WERE YOU CHARGED? _____

IF YES, WHAT WAS THE DISPOSITION? _____

PROGRAM EXPERIENCES:

1. WHICH PROGRAMS DID YOU PARTICIPATE IN BEFORE YOUR RELEASE
FROM M.Y.C. AND RATE EACH PROGRAM - GOOD, AVERAGE OR POOR
(IF GOOD OR POOR ASK FOR COMMENTS)

A) SOCIAL THINKING SKILLS _____

B) SUBSTANCE ABUSE INTERVENTION _____

C) SEXUAL OFFENDER PROGRAM _____

D) RESIDENT EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM _____

E) RELIGIOUS EDUCATION PROGRAM _____

F) GYM _____

G) ACADEMIC EDUCATION _____

2. DO YOU THINK THAT YOU BENEFITTED FROM BEING IN THE MANITOBA
YOUTH CENTRE? _____

3. WHAT TYPES OF PROGRAMS SHOULD BE OFFERED WHICH WOULD HELP
YOU WITHIN THE COMMUNITY? _____

APPENDIX E:

INTERVIEW CONSENT FORM

INTERVIEW CONSENT FORM:

I, _____

CONSENT TO BE INTERVIEWED BY NANCY BARKWELL (A STUDENT AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA) FOR THE STUDY "A FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF YOUNG OFFENDERS RELEASED FROM A YOUTH CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION."

I UNDERSTAND THAT:

- THE PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY IS TO INTERVIEW YOUTH WHO HAVE BEEN IN SECURE CUSTODY AT THE MANITOBA YOUTH CENTRE AND TO DESCRIBE THEIR ADJUSTMENT IN THE COMMUNITY AND THEIR VIEWS OF THEIR INSTITUTIONAL PROGRAM EXPERIENCE.
- MY PARTICIPATION IN THIS STUDY IS VOLUNTARY AND THAT I CAN END THE INTERVIEW AT ANY TIME.
- INFORMATION THAT I SHARE WILL REMAIN CONFIDENTIAL.
- MY PARTICIPATION IN THE STUDY WILL NOT HAVE ANY IMPACT ON MY CURRENT OR FUTURE INVOLVEMENT WITH CORRECTIONS.

I AM OVER 18 YEARS OF AGE AND HAVE THE RIGHT TO CONSENT TO BE INTERVIEWED AND I HAVE READ THIS FORM PRIOR TO SIGNING IT AND FULLY UNDERSTAND ITS CONTENTS.

DATE: _____ PRINT NAME: _____

SIGNATURE: _____

I AM THE PARENT OR GUARDIAN OF THE ABOVE AND I CONSENT TO HIS PARTICIPATION ON HIS BEHALF.

DATE: _____ PRINT NAME: _____

SIGNATURE: _____

DATE OF BIRTH OF MINOR: _____

APPENDIX F:

SAMPLES' RATINGS OF MANITOBA YOUTH CENTRES' PROGRAMS

PROGRAM	# OF SUBJECTS ATTENDED N=28		RATINGS	
		GOOD	AVERAGE	POOR
SOCIAL THINKING SKILLS	19	14 (74%)	4 (21%)	1 (5%)
SUBSTANCE ABUSE INTERVENTION	16	8 (50%)	2 (12%)	6 (38%)
SEXUAL OFFENDER PROGRAM	2	2 (100%)	0	0
RESIDENT EMPLOYMENT	21	9 (43%)	5 (24%)	7 (33%)
RELIGIOUS EDUCATION	21	10 (48%)	8 (40%)	3 (15%)
RECREATION	28	19 (68%)	7 (25%)	2 (7%)
MATHEMATICS	18	7 (39%)	6 (33%)	5 (28%)
LANGUAGE ARTS	13	11 (85%)	2 (15%)	0
LIFE STYLES	8	5 (63%)	0	3 (37%)
FAMILY LIFE	10	8 (80%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)
ADOLESCENT DEVELOPMENT	12	9 (75%)	3 (25%)	0
COMMUNICATION SKILLS	11	2 (18%)	3 (27%)	6 (55%)
LIFE SKILLS	7	1 (14%)	2 (29%)	4 (57%)
WORK EDUCATION	8	5 (63%)	3 (37%)	0

APPENDIX G:
YOUTHS' EXPERIENCES WITHIN THREE AREAS

DESCRIPTION	NO. OF YOUTH	PERCENTAGE OF YOUTH
REINVOLVEMENT WITH THE LAW		
No reinvolved	5	18%
Reinvolved and in community	6	22%
Reinvolved and in custody	17	60%
TOTAL	28	100%
SCHOOL/WORK INVOLVEMENT		
Involved in School	1	3%
Experienced school and work and returned to school	3	11%
Experienced school and quit	7	25%
Experienced work and quit	7	25%
Experienced school and work and quit	5	18%
Not involved in school or work	5	18%
TOTAL	28	100%
LIVING SITUATION		
No change in living situation	3	11%
Changed living situation (once or twice)	18	64%
Changed living situation many times (3 or more)	7	25%
TOTAL	28	100%

APPENDIX H:
REINVOLVEMENT WITH THE LAW

REINVOLVEMENT WITH THE LAW	SCHOOL/WORK INVOLVEMENT							LIVING SITUATION		
	SCHOOL	SCHOOL & WORK & RETURNED TO SCHOOL	SCHOOL/ QUIT	WORK/QUIT	SCHOOL & WORK & QUIT	NO INVOLVEMENT		0 CHANGES	1 & 2 CHANGES	3+ CHANGES
NO REINVOLVEMENT	1	0	0	2	2	0	(5)	1	4	0
REINVOLVED & IN COMMUNITY	0	3	1	1	1	0	(6)	2	3	1
REINVOLVED & IN CUSTODY	0	0	6	4	2	5	(17)	0	11	6
TOTAL	1	3	7	7	5	5	(28)	3	18	7

APPENDIX I:
YOUTHS' INDIVIDUAL PROGRAM EXPERIENCES WITHIN THE MANITOBA YOUTH CENTRE

#	Social Thinking Skills	Substance Abuse Intervention	Sexual Offender Program	Resident Employment	Religious Education	Recreation	Mathematics	Language Arts	Life Styles	Family Life	Adolescent development	Communication Skills	Life Skills	Work Education	TOTAL
1					X	X	X	X	X	X	X				7
2	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X			10
3					X	X	X	X	X		X		X		7
4	X	X			X	X	X			X					6
5	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X			X	10
6	X	X		X	X	X	X			X	X	X			9
7	X		X	X	X	X						X		X	7
8	X			X	X	X	X	X	X		X				8
9	X	X		X	X	X		X		X		X	X		9
10	X	X		X	X	X	X	X			X	X			9
11	X	X				X						X			4
12	X	X				X	X			X					5
13		X		X	X	X				X					4
14		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	10
15	X	X		X	X	X							X	X	7
16	X			X	X	X	X	X	X				X	X	9
17			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		11
18	X	X		X	X	X						X		X	7
19	X	X		X	X	X	X							X	7
20	X	X		X	X	X	X				X				7
21				X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X		8
22	X	X		X	X	X									5
23	X			X	X	X	X	X							6
24				X		X									2
25						X	X	X			X	X			5
26				X		X	X								3
27	X					X									2
28	X	X		X	X	X				X	X	X		X	9