

THE GUELPH ABATTOIR PROGRAMME:
AN INNOVATIVE APPROACH TO CORRECTIONAL INDUSTRIES
III. THE FOLLOW-UP

By

MICHAEL J. IRVINE

59/85



MINISTRY OF
CORRECTIONAL
SERVICES

Honourable Gordon Walker
Minister
Glenn R. Thompson
Deputy Minister

MINISTRY OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO



PLANNING AND SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION

M. J. Algar
Executive Director

PLANNING AND RESEARCH BRANCH

James J. Hug, Ph.D.
Director

A.C. Birkenmayer
Manager, Research Services

December 1978

NCJRS

JUL 11 1979

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ACQUISITIONS

Throughout this entire study, the various tasks would have been impossible were it not for the splendid cooperation of many individuals. The author would like to extend appreciation to all of the staff at the Guelph Correctional Centre and in particular to Mr. S. Keane, the former Superintendent, Mr. W. Taylor, the current Superintendent and Mr. K. Grottenthaler, the Senior Assistant Superintendent, for their cooperation, assistance and encouragement.

From the initial phases through to completion, the evaluation of the Abattoir Programme was facilitated and encouraged with great interest by Mr. J. Pahapill, Manager, Industrial Programmes Branch. His assistance was also much appreciated.

The author would also like to thank all of the staff of the Planning and Research Branch for their assistance and encouragement. All, in their own ways contributed meaningfully to the finished product of this evaluation.

Finally, recognition must be given to the many inmates and former inmates who willingly participated in the study. Their spirit of cooperation no doubt reflected a recognition that such evaluation is necessary to improve correctional programmes in the future.

OVERVIEW

This report is the final, follow-up review of the Guelph Abattoir Programme and follows two earlier reports on the inmates' and staff perceptions. The present results, based on interviews and Ministry files, indicate that the programme has had a beneficial impact on the qualitative aspects of post-release success. Former inmates who had been in the programme, worked longer overall, had the longest uninterrupted employment, and received higher wages. Some worked at the abattoir following release and the programme was frequently given credit for aiding post-release employment.

Recidivism rates were high (47%) and were not affected by the programme. Overall post-release success was, however, greater for the non-recidivists who had been in the programme than for the non-recidivists in the comparison group. The relative frequency of the types of crimes committed during the follow-up period was similar to past criminal activity.

The programme was judged to have been instrumental in improving relations with families and also lessened the post-release financial burden.

In retrospect, the former inmates recalled that their experiences in the programme had been positive. Indeed, the favourable attitudes that were evident during the earlier phases of the research were also evident in the follow-up period.

The results of the follow-up analyses are discussed in relation to the predictions and findings presented in the earlier reports and a brief review of the positive and negative features of the programme is included.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Acknowledgement.....	i
Overview.....	ii
Table of Contents.....	iii
List of Tables.....	iv
I INTRODUCTION.....	1
II DESCRIPTION OF THE ABATTOIR PROGRAMME.....	3
III METHODOLOGY.....	5
A. Focus.....	5
B. Procedure.....	5
IV RESULTS.....	6
A. Employment Success.....	6
B. Family and Home Stability.....	8
C. Financial Stability.....	8
D. Recidivism.....	9
E. Programme Experiences Reviewed.....	11
V DISCUSSION.....	13
VI CONCLUSION.....	18
REFERENCES.....	19

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Employment Search Approaches.....	7
2	Recidivism - Offence Categories.....	10
3	Sentences Imposed on Recidivists.....	11

I INTRODUCTION

The Guelph Abattoir Programme, which began in June of 1975, was the first Outside Managed Industrial Programme (O.M.I.P.) to be operated by the Ontario Ministry of Correctional Services (M.C.S.). The principal goal was to provide a more realistic work experience for selected inmates by placing the operation of the correctional industrial facility, and the employment of the inmates, under the control of a private company.

Similar programmes, involving food service and small manufacturing industries have since been implemented in other correctional institutions. Since the Abattoir Programme is the first of its kind however, it has been the subject of a comprehensive evaluation by the Ministry's Planning and Research Branch. To date, two research reports have been produced. This is the third and final report and marks the conclusion of the evaluation.

The first report (Irvine, 1977) describes the correctional officers' response to both the O.M.I.P. concept and its implementation as the Abattoir Programme. The results were very encouraging. The officers concurred with the official Ministry policy on the goals of work programmes. They also strongly endorsed the Abattoir Programme and encouraged the development of similar future programmes in other institutions. Rehabilitation for the inmates was consistently identified as the most likely impact and very few problems or disruptions in routine were seen to have been created by the programme. In fact, the programme was viewed as instrumental in improving not only the behaviour of those involved in the programme but also the behaviour, in general, of all of the inmates in the institution.

The second report (Irvine, 1978) provides the results of interviews with inmates. The attitudes and responses of those who were employed in the Abattoir Programme (Employed Group) were compared with those of a representative sample of the other 'non-employed' inmates in the institution (Non-employed Group). The results were very favourable. It was indicated that inmates generally have positive attitudes toward work attitudes that are compatible with good work performance. Both inmate groups, in agreement with correctional officers, predicted that the programme would have a beneficial impact on the inmates involved. At the conclusion of their involvement in the programme, the Employed Group substantiated the predictions. They indicated that their attitudes toward work had improved, that their chances of obtaining post-release employment had improved and that the "impact of incarceration" had been lessened. The selection process for the programme was found to favour the "model inmate" who, typically, exhibited the greatest stability both prior to and during incarceration. Generally speaking, the programme was viewed by all inmates to be an attractive alternative to conventional incarceration.

Thus, in the opinion of the correctional officers and inmates, the Abattoir Programme has been successful. All of the groups agreed that the success to date, as well as the potential for success, justified any difficulties which may have been created. In the final analysis, however, consideration must be given to the lasting impact of the programme on the inmates after they have left the institution.

In this report, the focus is on a follow-up of the post-release successes and achievements of the inmates involved in the study. The topics that are dealt with specifically in this report include: recidivism, employment success, family and financial stability and retrospective analyses of the programme.

II DESCRIPTION OF THE ABATTOIR PROGRAMME

The Guelph Abattoir Programme initially involved both the abattoir and cannery facilities at the Guelph Correctional Centre*. The programme primarily seeks to provide a real work environment to an optimum of inmates. In particular, it is aimed at the development of good working habits and improving skills in obtaining and maintaining employment. Through the provision of suitable remuneration, the programme also seeks to provide accumulated savings to ease community re-entry, help support families and defray institutional expenses. Furthermore, useful, on-the-job training in various meat-packing skills is provided.

In the current arrangement, the Ministry leases the abattoir facilities to the company, and provides, at cost, the required servicing (i.e., electricity, steam, etc.). In addition, the Ministry provides a continuous supply of suitable inmate labour and any necessary security services. The company, in return, is obliged to provide the optimum number of employment positions for inmates and all necessary job training. Furthermore, they are expected to provide acceptable working conditions and remuneration. Business management of the abattoir is the sole responsibility of the company.

Prior to involvement in the programme, each inmate applicant must serve at least three months of his sentence. The institution then eliminates those who are security risks, have poor institutional conduct or outstanding court charges. The company is the final arbiter in the selection procedure. Employment begins with the availability of a position, hence there is little choice as to the task assigned.

During peak production, approximately 40 to 50 inmates are employed at the abattoir. Since the inception of the programme, inmates have from time-to-time been occupied in all but the most highly skilled positions. Generally, however, inmates are placed in less skilled positions on the "kill-floor", in shipping or in sanitation.

The starting wage is \$3.15 per hour and opportunity for increases is available. Violations of a temporary leave of absence, institutional misconduct and poor work performance all constitute grounds for removal from the programme. Inmates are permitted to voluntarily withdraw from the programme but generally cease their employment upon completion of their sentences. A few, with Ministry approval, have continued as civilian employees upon release. Understandably, continued employment at the abattoir is not encouraged. Extensive con-

* The present company is the second to be involved in the programme. In November, 1975, the original company went into receivership resulting in a complete suspension of the programme for approximately two months. The failure of the company was not due in any way to involvement in the Abattoir Programme. The present company has chosen to operate the abattoir only, hence the complete shut-down of the cannery.

tinued employment would greatly limit the availability of positions for incoming inmates. Furthermore, a potential for problems is created by having inmates and former inmates working together.

In late August 1977, the Canadian Food and Allied Workers (AFL-CIO) assumed responsibility for negotiations on behalf of all of the abattoir employees, including the inmates*. While the implications of union representation would be of great interest, the present findings are based on data collected before union involvement.

The O.M.I.P. inmates pay \$5.00 per day for room and board, and are housed together in a dormitory within the institution. As a result of construction and remodeling in the institution, the actual dormitory assigned to these inmates has changed. They are presently occupying the third dormitory since the inception of the programme. All other facilities (recreation, cafeteria, etc.,) are shared with the other inmates in the institution.

Other disruptions in the institution occur. In particular, the varying inmate work schedules impose scheduling difficulties for the kitchen staff and require inmates to keep unorthodox sleeping hours.

The responsibilities of correctional officers vary according to the amount of direct exposure to the inmates in the programme. The officers assigned to the dormitory encounter the employed inmates most frequently. The majority, however, are assigned to other dormitories and thus experience a minimum of interaction and exposure. Some officers are periodically assigned to security doors or the reception area, and come into occasional contact with the inmates involved in the programmes**.

* A standard three-month probation precedes full union membership. For inmates, as well as civilians, the starting wage was revised to \$3.25 per hour with an additional \$1.75 per hour held back and paid in full upon successful completion of the probation.

** The above describes the programme as it was operated at the time of data collection. A major feature of the programme has been its continued state of change (see Irvine, 1978). At the present time, and as was suggested in both of the two earlier research reports, the employed inmates are no longer living in the institution and sharing facilities with other inmates. They now reside in a Community Resource Centre on the institution's property. Many of the problems involving contraband, scheduling and security should now be alleviated.

III METHODOLOGY

A. Focus

As the final phase in the evaluation of the Abattoir Programme, this report focuses on the relative post-release success of the inmates who were in the Employed and Non-employed Groups. The more important criteria of "success" fall into the categories of employment success, family stability, financial stability and recidivism. In addition, attitudes and assessments of the programme, taken in retrospect, are included. Because this is the final research report, attempts are made to summarize all of the research findings in an overall discussion of the "evaluation" of the programme.

B. Procedure

Recidivism data, relating to the 12 months immediately following release, were gathered from the M.C.S. files of 309 former inmates involved in the study. One hundred and thirty-seven were formerly in the Non-employed Group and the remaining 172 were from the Employed Group. Of the 172, 71% (N=122) were those who had been in the programme for three months or more. They are the Employed Group inmates who were discussed in the second report (Irvine, 1978). The remaining 50 former Employed Group inmates, included in this analysis, were those who were in the programme for less than three months but remained at the Guelph Correctional Centre until their release (no transfers). This group was deleted from analyses in the second report because an involvement of less than three months was considered to be insufficient for any programme benefit to occur. They were included in the present recidivism data collection because comparisons of this "unsuccessful" group with the remaining, more successful group were warranted.

The relevant data collected from the files included: the type of discharge from the centre, the number of days until the first reconviction, the number of subsequent reconvictions and whether reincarceration occurred. In addition, the types of offences and the sentences imposed were recorded.

Follow-up interviews were conducted with 123 former inmates approximately eight months after release from the institution. Fifty-five were from the Employed group and the remaining 68 were from the comparison group. The total represents 67% of the interviews that were originally sought. The remaining former inmates could not be located for the interview.

The interviews sought information concerning employment success, the impact of the programme on family and financial situations, contacts with law enforcement agencies and self-reported recidivism. The interviews also elicited a review of the former inmates' experiences at the Guelph Correctional Centre and in particular with the Abattoir Programme.

IV RESULTS

Of the 123 former inmates who were interviewed, 46% were reincarcerated, and only 22% were engaged in full-time employment. The remainder were either unemployed but actively seeking work (19%), unemployed but not looking for work (8%) or enrolled in some education programme (5%). These rates were the same for both inmate groups.

The relative ease in tracing former inmates who have been reincarcerated contributes largely to the high proportion who were in an institution at the time of the interview.

There were no substantial between-group differences in the amount of time between the date of their release from the Guelph Correctional Centre and the date of the interview (approximately eight months).

A. Employment Success

Because the Abattoir Programme is an industrial programme, the relative employment success could be considered to be the primary post-release success criterion. In the immediate period after release, there were no differences between the two groups and, indeed, the results were not particularly encouraging. Only 25% began working immediately - the majority for a new employer. A total of 69% were unemployed; 29% - looking for work and 40% - taking "time off for a holiday". There were no differences between the two groups in terms of the amount of time spent unemployed but looking for work (average 6.2 weeks) nor in the amount of time spent unemployed and not seeking work (average 3.4 weeks). During the entire release period, 23% of the inmates were never employed. The most frequently cited problem in the job searches was the unavailability of jobs (33%). Having a criminal record played a much less significant role (7%) in the job search difficulties.

Despite the failure of the above criteria to distinguish the two groups, some encouraging differences were found. During the entire post-release period, the former Employed Group inmates were employed full-time for a longer period - average 20.7 weeks as compared with 14.1 weeks ($t = 2.89$, $p < .01$)*. In addition the Employed Group experienced the longest uninterrupted employment - average 13.9 weeks as compared with 8.5 weeks ($t = 3.06$, $p < .01$). They also averaged a higher salary rate - \$6.00 per hour as compared with \$4.40 per hour ($t = 4.43$, $p < .001$).

In terms of attribution, a higher proportion of former inmates from the Employed Group felt that their institutional

* The t test is a standardized measure of the difference between the means of the two groups in terms of the dispersion within each group. The p or probability level indicates the statistical reliability or degree of confidence one can have in the results. Thus $p < .01$ indicates that the result will occur by chance and chance alone in less than one time out of 100.

work experiences were a help to them in getting a job ($\chi^2 = 15.72$, $p < .001$)* Eleven of the former Employed Group inmates (20%) were, in fact, hired as civilians at the abattoir following their release from jail. This number, however, does not likely reflect a proportion but rather the total number from the study sample who were re-hired. Nevertheless, the abattoir was the industry at the Guelph Correctional Centre that was most frequently given credit for helping meet the requirements of post-release employment ($\chi^2 = 4.72$, $p < .05$).

A composite score of "Job Success" was computed for each former inmate. This score which took into account wages, the length of stable employment and the total time employed, was used to help determine the real impact of the Abattoir Programme. For both groups, there was a consistent relationship between the Job Success score and recidivism**. Non-recidivists consistently had higher (better) Job Success scores. For the former inmates in the Employed Group however, this relationship was significantly greater ($\chi^2 = 4.19$, $p < .05$). This is the most encouraging and significant finding in this phase of the evaluation. It indicates that all other concerns being equal, non-recidivists who were involved in the Abattoir Programme demonstrated better post-release employment success than their non-recidivist counterparts in the comparison group of former non-employed inmates. By contrast, comparisons between the recidivists in the two groups revealed no differences in Job Success.

As indicated in Table 1, a variety of approaches to finding work were used, all with only moderate success. It is interesting to note that the more conventional and common

TABLE I			EMPLOYMENT SEARCH APPROACHES	
<u>Approach</u>	<u>Proportion Used</u>	<u>Rate of Success</u>		
Canada Manpower	64%	22%		
Walk Streets	59	31		
Newspaper	49	22		
Friends - helping	40	45		
Friends - hiring	32	53		
Previous Employer	28	43		

* The chi-square (χ^2) statistic is a measure of the systematic relationship between two variables and reflects the reliable discrepancy between expected and observed frequencies of events.

** In this case Recidivism is defined as reconviction or a technical parole violation. The actual rates and relevant statistics can be found in Section D on page 16.

approaches (Canada Manpower, Newspapers, Walking Streets) tended to be the least successful. Friends and previous employers, although used less frequently, were more often successful in helping inmates find employment.

Unemployment Insurance Premiums were collected by a relatively high proportion of former Employed Group inmates - 52.7% as compared with 10.3% ($\chi^2 = 21.06$, $p < .001$). In the immediate period following release, 40% of the Employed Group collected the premiums. Half of this sub-group ($N = 11$) never did find employment. By contrast, only five of the comparison group (7%) initially collected Unemployment Insurance Premiums; only one of whom was never eventually employed.

B. Family and Home Stability

Upon release, 34% of the former inmates resumed residence with their parents. Eighteen percent resided initially with other relatives and 14% with their wives. The remaining 34% for the most part lived alone, with friends or in halfway houses during initial periods. Seventy-three percent of the former inmates changed residences at some time during the eight months, averaging 2.7 different locations. As was noted earlier, 46% of those who were interviewed, were returned to a correctional institution at some time during the release period.

Improvements in relationships with family members were noticed by a greater proportion of former Employed Group inmates ($\chi^2 = 7.21$, $p < .01$). The data further indicate that although few ($N = 15$) former Non-employed inmates had families to support, the majority of the families were dependent on government assistance during their supporters' incarceration. Many of the former inmates agreed that relations with their families had suffered as a result of their not being able to provide support.

C. Financial Stability

It was anticipated that because of the wages earned in the programme, the Employed Group inmates would experience fewer financial problems upon release from the institution. The results indicate that this prediction was accurate. As reported during the interviews, the overall financial burden was significantly less for the former Employed Group inmates ($\chi^2 = 15.97$, $p < .001$). Only 5.5% of this group reported having financial problems upon release as compared with 20.8% of the former Non-employed inmates. In total, 82% of those who had been in the programme reported that they had either no financial problems or only minor, temporary problems during the entire release period. Indeed, significantly fewer former Employed inmates had to borrow money during the period ($\chi^2 = 6.34$, $p < .02$).

Earlier in this report, it was noted that the inmates who had worked at the abattoir were more likely to collect Unemployment Insurance Premiums, especially in the period immediately following release ($\chi^2 = 21.06$, $p < .001$). It is likely that many of the between-group differences in overall financial stability can be attributed to having Unemployment

Insurance Premiums as well as accumulated savings and higher wages.

The value of having suitable wages was emphasized by former inmates from both groups. Almost all of the Employed Group (87%) cited the wages as a major reason for having applied for the programme.

Seventy-eight percent of those who had families reported having forwarded some of their earnings home while they were involved in the programme. Former inmates from the Non-employed Group were also aware of the advantages of wages. Forty-six percent specifically indicated that they would have benefited from the programme because they would have had money for the immediate post-release period.

D. Recidivism

During the interview, 76% of the former inmates (N=93) reported that since being released, they had had some contact with the police. For the most part, these contacts were infrequent. Forty-two percent of the contacts reportedly resulted in convictions. Forty-one percent were either warned or questioned only. The remainder had their charges dropped (7%) or were awaiting court appearances (9%). There were no between-group differences. The major reasons why many of the former inmates were in trouble again included: "stupidity" - 29%, drugs and alcohol - 22% and associating with the wrong people - 11%.

In the first 12 months immediately following release, the recidivism rates for the two groups that were recorded on MCS files did not differ. Furthermore, length of involvement in the Abattoir Programme was not related to recidivism. Recidivism of those who were in the programme for less than three months was not different from that of the other Employed Group inmates.

The results gathered from 309 MCS files indicated that 40% (N = 124) of the total of both groups were released from the institution on parole. Thirty-five percent of the parolees were returned to jail for violation of parole, two-thirds of whom had other additional charges. Involvement in the Abattoir Programme did not enhance parole eligibility. This is contrary to what had been expected by many inmates. The programme also appears to have little relationship to success in observing parole stipulations.

Recidivism was not affected by the programme. Indeed, recidivism data for the 12 month period were not overly favourable*. Forty-two percent (N = 130) were reconvicted for at least one charge during the 12 months. Taking into account those who were reincarcerated for technical parole violations but no other charges (N = 15), the total recidivism rate for the former inmates in this study was 46.5%. Thirty-nine percent (N = 120) had been reincarcerated. Expectations that recidivism rates for former Employed Group inmates might at least be deferred, were not supported. There were no reliable between-group differences in the length of time from release to first conviction.

* It must be remembered that all of the inmates including those in the Employed Group, were recidivists prior to their involvement in the study (see Irvine, 1978).

A breakdown of the types of subsequent crimes committed by the former inmates from both groups is presented in Table 2. Property offences were consistently the most frequently committed. The two groups were not reliably different ($p > .05$) but the former inmates from the Non-employed Group did tend to commit proportionately more property offences (i.e. thefts, break and enter).

Although there are no readily available explanations, it is interesting that the majority of Liquor and Traffic offences were committed by former inmates in the Employed Group.

TABLE 2		RECIDIVISM - OFFENCE CATEGORIES			
		Employed (N=172)		Non-Employed (N=137)	
<u>Type of Crime</u>		<u>N of Persons</u>	<u>N of Charges</u>	<u>N of Persons</u>	<u>N of Charges</u>
Property		34	83	34	83
Traffic		21	31	11	16
Public Order/Peace		16	23	16	23
Liquor		14	21	5	5
Personal Injury		8	10	6	11
Drug		6	8	6	6
Morals and Decency		2	3	0	0

Public Order, Personal Injury and Drug offences were committed equally by the former inmates in the two groups. Morals offences are generally infrequent (Irvine, 1978). Chance likely accounts for the fact that all of the Morals offences, in this survey, were committed by former inmates from the Employed group. In general, however, the criminal activity of all of the former inmates, in the 12 month post-release period, was similar to the criminal activity which had occurred in the past (Irvine, 1978).

The types of sentences received by the recidivists in the two groups are presented in Table 3. Although there were no statistically reliable differences between the two groups, there were some interesting and consistent trends. With the exception of the most severe jail sentence (over 2 years), incarceration was consistently given to more former inmates from the Non-employed Group. By comparison, former Employed Group inmates seemed more likely to receive discretionary sentences.

In total, over 70% of alternative fine or time sentences resulted in incarceration. Although the option was available to a proportionately greater number of former Employed Group inmates (35% as compared to 18%), the proportion who actually served time was approximately equal (73% as compared to 79%).

Of the 55 former Employed inmates interviewed, 11 had continued as civilian employees at the abattoir following their release from the institution. Of these 11, only one (9%) was reconvicted during the 12 month follow-up period.

TABLE 3

SENTENCES IMPOSED ON RECIDIVISTS

<u>Sentence</u>	<u>Employed (N=69)</u>	<u>Non-employed (N=60)</u>
Alternate <u>Fine/Time</u>	13%	5%
Alternate <u>Fine/Time</u>	35%	18%
Probation	20%	12%
Suspended Sentence	6%	3%
<hr/>		
1-30 days	35%	38%
31 days to 3 months	22%	27%
over 3 months to 1 year	25%	28%
over 1 year to 2 years	12%	17%
over 2 years	9%	8%

In the final analysis therefore, with the exception of this latter group, the Abattoir Programme had absolutely no impact on recidivism. The reader is referred to Section A: Employment Success for results which indicate that within the recidivists and non-recidivist groups, the programme had a differential impact on qualitative post-release success.

E. Programme Experiences Reviewed

It is interesting to note the extent to which the favourable attitudes, that the inmates had during incarceration (Irvine, 1978), were also evident some eight months later, after release. In retrospect, 58% recalled having received more respect from the correctional staff. More (76%) remembered having more responsibility while they were in the programme. Eighty-seven percent felt that serving a sentence had become less of a waste of time and 75% noted that the programme also enabled them to make more realistic plans for the future. The majority therefore, continued to view the programme favourably.

The majority (62%) also recalled some resentment on the part of the other inmates to their being paid for their work. No serious incidents were remembered however; only isolated comments. Seventy-one percent reported that at the time that they applied for the programme, they were aware of

the special privileges involved. Only one-third, however, admitted that the privileges were the main reason for their applying. As recalled by those who had been in the programme, the major expected benefits were: financial gains (87%), work experience (41%) and daily passes from the institution (16%).

Only 11% felt that, in retrospect, their experiences in the programme had been worse than they had expected. By comparison, 49% found that their experiences had been better than expected. For the remainder (40%) the expectations had been met. The few who were dissatisfied (11%) complained of poor training, less freedom than was expected and difficulties in working with civilians.

In reviewing the programme benefits, all of the former Employed Group inmates reported that they had achieved something as a result of their involvement in the programme. Individual differences were evident but were largely related to original differences in expectations and to differences in the extent to which the inmates applied themselves to the programme.

Suggestions and recommendations were volunteered by some of the former Employed inmates. The suggestions included: expanding the programme to enable more inmates to get involved; isolating programme inmates from the rest of the institution and improving the living facilities*; giving priority to those with families and helping the inmates find similar employment following release.

The former inmates who had been in the Non-Employed Group, understandably had less to say about the Abattoir Programme. Almost all, however (84%), did recall that they were aware of the privileges that those in the programme enjoyed. A slight majority (58%) also felt that there had been some resentment to the privileges by those not in the programme. This is roughly equal to the proportion of former Employed Group inmates (62%) who had sensed the same reaction.

In view of their experiences following release from the institution, 65% felt that they would have benefited had they been involved in the programme. The reasons given included: having more money on release, job training, work experience, more freedom and a job reference.

* This problem has been solved by the placing of the currently employed inmates in a Community Resource Centre.

V DISCUSSION

A. The Follow-up

The long-term impact of the Abattoir Programme fulfilled many of the predictions that were made in the earlier phases of this research. Indeed, the results can be interpreted as being very encouraging and as having demonstrated that the programme has successfully achieved many of its goals. As was predicted by the Correctional Officers (Irvine, 1977), the programme did have a rehabilitative impact, especially on post-release employment. Predictions, by the C.O.'s that wages would promote family and financial responsibility also proved to be correct. In contrast, however, the C.O.'s also predicted that the programme would increase the likelihood that the inmates would seek employment, immediately after release. In the end, this was not the case. There were no differences between the two groups in the proportions who were initially unemployed and who remained unemployed.

Many inmate predictions of a favourable impact were also supported by the follow-up data. As was expected, those who had been in the programme experienced higher post-release employment success. They also experienced less of a financial burden as a result of having savings accumulated. As was also anticipated from earlier predictions, experiences in Ministry-operated industries were less helpful for subsequent employment.

In the end, the follow-up interviews indicated that the programme had a long-term positive impact on those who had been involved. They were employed longer, had the longest uninterrupted employment and were being paid more for their work. Non-recidivists from the Employed Group were particularly successful in comparison with non-recidivists from the Non-employed group. For the majority with families to support, the wages that they received and forwarded were instrumental in improving relations with the families. In general, the total financial picture was better for the former Employed inmates. Fewer had to borrow money. Fewer had serious financial problems immediately upon release and the group in general, fared better, financially, throughout the entire follow-up period.

Earlier in the research (Irvine, 1977) it was noted that the Correctional Officers viewed the programme as tending to select the "model inmates", a fact which, as they suggested, would hamper a successful evaluation of the programme. The C.O.'s felt that the inmates who were selected, might succeed regardless of the impact of the programme. The selectivity or "elitism" in the selection procedure was demonstrated in the second research report (Irvine, 1978) and the problems related to this are discussed. While it can be argued that the programme was intended for the better inmates, the results of the follow-up phase showed that the selectivity of the "model inmates" was also not as critical an issue as was anticipated.

In many respects, the two groups did not differ. There were absolutely no differences in recidivism. Also, the recidivists from the Employed Group and the Non-employed Group did not differ in the overall post-release success. Within the total who were non-recidivists, those who had been in the Abattoir Programme reported significant increases in post-release success. It is possible that this group essentially comprises the "Model inmates" portion of the study. In many other respects however, this group was not different from the others in the study. In addition, they all consistently attributed their success to the programme. Therefore, the impact of the programme on this group cannot be ignored and at least partial credit for their success must be given to the programme.

Inmates from both groups appear to have been overly optimistic about the chances for post-release employment. Almost all (90%) were initially planning to seek work (Irvine, 1978). In the end, however, 23% were unemployed throughout the entire follow-up period. In the interviews prior to release, 49% claimed to have a firm job awaiting them. In reality however, only half of them were employed immediately following release.

Twenty-one percent of the Employed Group inmates originally expected to find work in an abattoir (Irvine, 1978). Of those who were interviewed, 20% were employed as civilians at the Guelph Abattoir. None, apparently, found employment at an abattoir that was not operated by the company involved in this programme. It is not likely that 20% of the total Employed Group found employment in the meat industry. The proportion of those who were interviewed is likely an over-estimate of the proportion who actually found abattoir work. This sub-sample (continued at abattoir) is probably close to the total, for the inmates who continued as abattoir employees were relatively easy to trace for the follow-up interview.

The group who did continue as abattoir employees can be viewed as the most successful in this study. It is interesting that although the sample size was small ($N = 11$), the trends indicate that this group had the best post-release success on all dimensions. In fact, it is the only group with substantially less recidivism. It is not suggested here, that continued abattoir employment be made a goal of the programme. A trend is evident however. Those inmates who applied themselves to the programme most, also fared best in the follow-up period.

Because of the wages that the inmates were receiving while in the programme, most were technically eligible for Unemployment Insurance Premiums (U.I.P.) upon release. The Non-employed Group inmates did not enjoy this benefit. Consequently there were vast differences between the groups in the extent to which U.I.P. was collected. It is likely that the low extent of financial difficulty, reported by the Employed Group, can partially be attributed to the greater availability and use of unemployment assistance. The trend also indicates that proportionately more former Employed Group inmates collected U.I.P. initially and never did find employment.

Reductions in property-related offences (i.e. theft, break and enter, fraud) did not occur as a result of increased financial stability. The stability also did not have a delaying effect on the length of time from release to first re-conviction.

Reduced recidivism was not a primary goal of the Abattoir Programme. Employment issues were more critical. All of the inmates, including those in the programme, were already recidivists with extensive criminal histories. The high recidivism rates that occurred in the follow-up period were, therefore, not encouraging but were also not too unexpected. The relative frequency of the types of crimes that were committed was very similar to the frequency of crimes committed in the past. It would appear, therefore, that little had changed for the recidivists, whether or not they were involved in the Abattoir Programme. Neither post-release employment success nor the type of criminal involvement were affected.

It is encouraging that the favourable attitudes toward the programme, that have been evident throughout the research, are still evident in the follow-up period. The majority from Employed Group consistently recalled that their experiences had been positive. Only a small proportion felt that their experiences had been worse than was expected. The former inmates from the Non-employed Group also viewed the programme favourably. Most remembered the privileges that went with the programme and many recalled resentment over their not having the same privileges. The majority however agreed that, in view of their post-release experiences, they would have benefited from being involved in the programme.

The Programme in Review

Because this is the final report of the evaluation of the Abattoir Programme, an encapsulated review of all of the research findings is appropriate. In this section the negative features are listed separately from the positive findings. The results are not listed in any particular order of importance and no attempt has been made to apply weights to any of the features. The reader is left to decide on the balance of the two lists.

Negative

- Poor communication about programme in initial phases.
- Rigid selection procedure.
- Only limited trade training.
- Only limited demand for experienced abattoir workers in community - highly specialized field.
- Change in companies disrupted programme.

- Long waiting list of applicants seen as a source of abuse - inmates more easily fired if there are suitable replacements.
- Numerous, disruptive shifts in dormitories.
- Perceived differential treatment of civilians and inmates.
- Scheduling difficulties created by temporary absence.
- Increased contraband.
- Resentment from regular inmates.
- Misuse of financial support by spouses.
- Simultaneous collection of welfare and other assistance, by spouses, while receiving support from inmates.
- Retention of "inmate identity" at abattoir as a result of prison clothing and too many inmates.
- Very high turnover rate - less than half remain in programme until release.
- No reductions in recidivism.
- Eligibility for Unemployment Insurance Premiums upon release.

Positive

- Stable and favourable attitude by C.O.'s, inmates involved in programme, and regular inmates.
- C.O.'s job made easier.
- Incarceration made easier.
- Reduced friction between C.O.'s and inmates.
- Perceived improvements in institutional conduct of all inmates.
- Predictions by inmates, of a high level of post-release success.
- Improvements in general attitude.
- Increased self-responsibility.
- Increased family responsibility.

- Increased financial responsibility.
- Most married inmates provided continued family support with improved relations and beneficial results.
- Basically constructive use of savings accumulated from wages.
- Incarceration was seen to be less of a waste of time.
- Inmates who resigned or were fired, continued to have favourable attitudes about the programme - almost all were interested in returning to the programme.
- Everyone interviewed encouraged the Abattoir Programme and any future similar programmes.
- With the exception of changes in routine, there were virtually no institutional problems created.
- Beneficial impact on overall post-release employment - length of employment, wages.
- Beneficial impact on post-release family stability.
- Beneficial impact on post-release financial stability.
- Programme viewed favourably in retrospect (8 months).
- In retrospect, Non-employed group feel they would have benefited.

VI CONCLUSION

In the final analysis, the assessment of the Abattoir Programme has to consider many different factors. The evaluation that is now completed was largely of a process nature and concentrated on the behavioural and attitudinal components. Financial and economic assessments would probably be useful but were not intended to be part of this analysis. In the balance of the relative merits of the programme, the reader alone must decide on the veracity of the Abattoir Programme as an acceptable alternative approach to correctional industries. Were the important goals achieved? Were a sufficient number beneficially affected? Are the indices of success acceptable?

In the estimation of the author, the programme has been a success. This feeling is based on the immeasurable and accumulative effect of many positive interviews with many inmates during all phases of the study. In some instances the former inmates would express frustration over not being able to adequately convey the full extent of impact that the programme has had on them.

Despite the disruptions, aggravations and in some respects, the less than "statistically significant" results, the programme is worthwhile and the development of others similar to it should be encouraged. In due time, and with continued data accumulation, variations of this type of industry should be found to be the answer for many of the men brought into the correctional system.

REFERENCES

Irvine, M.J. (1977) The Guelph Abattoir Programme:
An Innovative Approach to Correctional Industries.
I. Staff Response. Planning and Research Branch,
Ministry of Correctional Services, Province of
Ontario, 1977.

Irvine, M.J. (1978) The Guelph Abattoir Programme:
An Innovative Approach to Correctional Industries.
II. Inmate Response. Planning and Research,
Ministry of Correctional Services, Province of
Ontario, 1978.

END