

COMMUNITY RESOURCE CENTRES

A ONE YEAR FOLLOW-UP STUDY

BY

DALE K. ARDRON

PLANNING AND RESEARCH BRANCH



Ontario

**Ministry of
Correctional
Services**

**Honourable
Frank Drea
Minister
Glenn R. Thompson
Deputy Minister**

59/86

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

October 1978

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
List of Tables	i
Summary	1
(1) Introduction and Study Design	3
(2) Data Analysis	4
(3) Background Characteristics	4
(4) Reconvictions	6
(5) Outcome and Related Factors	8
(5-A) Factors Related to Non-completion	10
(5-B) Recidivism and the Short Term Resident	17
(5-C) A Final Comment on Outcome	21
(6) Employment and Finances	22
(7) Some Major Factors Related to Recidivism:	25
(7-A) Interpersonal Problems at the Time of Admission	25
(7-B) Emotional Health	25
(7-C) Use of Leisure Time	25
(7-D) Drug Problems at the Time of Discharge	26
(7-E) Probation and Parole Record	26
(8) Residents' Perceptions of the CRCs	26
(8-A) Utility of Centres' Assistance	27
(8-B) CRCs vs Jails	27
(8-C) Utility of Community Resources	27
(8-D) Effect on Interpersonal Relations	27
(9) Discussion	28
(10) References	31
(11) Appendices	
(11-A) Cochran's Method of Partitioning the Chi-Square	33
(11-B) Supplementary Tables	35

NCJRS

JUL 11 1979

ACQUISITIONS

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
1 Background Parameters	5
2 Recidivism by CRC vs TAP	6
3 Type of Offence	7
4 Dispositions	8
5 Percent Recidivating within Length of Stay by Programme Completion	9
6 Criminal Involvement by Programme Completion	10
7 Number of Problems by Programme Completion	11
8 Percent Not Completing the Programme within Number of Problems by Length of Stay	12
9 Percent Recidivating within Problems by Length of Stay	13
10 Length of Stay by Treatment	14
11 Number of Weak Prospects by Programme Completion	15
12 Level of Preparation by Programme Completion	16
13 Length of Stay in Programme by Recidivism (Programme Completers only)	17
14 Recidivism by Average Length of Present Sentence	18
15 Length of Stay in CRC Programme by Average Length of Time Sentenced (Programme Completers only)	18
16 Recidivism by Average Number of Present Offences	19
17 Length of Stay in CRC Programme by Average Number of Present Offences (Programme Completers only)	19
18 Recidivism by Average Number of Prior Offences (Programme Completers only)	20
19 Recidivism by CRC vs TAP (Programme Completers only)	21
20 Recidivism by When Obtained Present Job	22
21 Recidivism by Employment History	23
22 Recidivism by Post-Discharge Employment History	24

SUMMARY

The present study was initiated to determine the outcomes of men who were admitted to a Community Resource Centre (CRC). In particular, it was designed to supplement the data reported by Ian Sone & Associates in their report Community Resource Centres Study (1976). At that time, it was stated that the recidivism data collected six months after discharge was insufficient to measure the outcome from CRC intervention. The present study found that recidivism increased to 30% for a one year follow-up period from the initial 11.6% reported for the six month follow-up period. Consideration was given to factors associated with recidivism rates and to characteristics of men who did not complete their CRC programme.

Specifically, it was found that, among the men who completed their planned term in the Centres, length of stay in the CRCs was related to the length of sentence for which the men were serving time. Short term residents (one month or less) were convicted of lesser criminal activities at the time of their admission to the CRCs. This was based on length of present sentence, number of offences for which they were serving time and measures of prior criminality. They demonstrated a significantly lower recidivism rate than long term residents (over one month). A considerably fewer number of problems experienced by short-term residents received any form of intervention during their brief stay in the Centres. However, it was argued that these men were admitted to the Centres for the purpose of pre-release planning. Owing to the CRCs' success in their dealings with these men, it was suggested that the use of the Centres by men in need of pre-release planning should be considered an essential role of the Centres.

Several other factors were found to be associated with recidivism. Recidivism rates were lowest among men who were identified by staff as not having a drug problem at the time of their discharge from the Centres. Furthermore, men who were able to make good use of leisure time and who were able to maintain a good employment record after their release into the community demonstrated a reduced recidivism rate.

Men who were involved in employment programmes at the Centres received the most benefit from their CRC experience if they had a stable work history, especially if they were able to maintain the same job during their stay in the programme which they had prior to being convicted. In this capacity, the CRCs were providing a viable alternative to intermittent sentencing in cases where a greater degree of supervision may have been required.

The initial weeks in the CRC programme were a critical period for determining continued involvement with the Centres. Most men who did not complete their programmes had their T.A. passes withdrawn or revoked during this period. The data indicated that the CRCs were able to manage their more criminally involved clients since programme completion was not contingent on the degree of prior criminality. Instead, it was found that the men who failed to adjust to the CRC programme within the first month of their stay, were experiencing many social problems. Often they were identified by staff as having drug or alcohol problems and were unable to make good use of leisure time. Undoubtedly these factors contributed to the staff rating these men as being ill-prepared for later community adjustment and as having poor prospects in managing potential problem areas after their release. Inherently, these factors precipitated an extraordinarily high recidivism rate among men who had been returned to the institution within the first month of their stay in the Centres.

Another group of clients being served by the Centres were those men who required long-term assistance (more than one month) for the problems they experienced. Typically, these men were more involved in criminal activities prior to intervention than the short-term residents. Most of the problem areas these men were identified as experiencing, received some form of "treatment" during their stay at the Centres. Unlike the short-term residents who received less treatment, the number of problems experienced by the long-term residents was not associated with future recidivism or the probability of being prematurely disqualified from the programme.

Men participating in the Temporary Absence Programme (TAP) were found to be a reliable comparison group with CRC residents based on a number of background characteristics. The major difference between the two groups may be attributed to different selection criteria of the programmes. It is possible that the TA programme was more concerned with the inmates' prior criminality, since there was a tendency for TAP men to have been less involved in criminal activities prior to intervention. While this factor may have underscored the higher programme completion rate among TAP men, it contradicts the observation of a slightly higher recidivism rate within this same group (38%).

Finally, former residents were more supportive of the facilities and programmes offered by the CRCs as compared to those of jails. Most men credited the CRCs for their eventual success in community adjustment.

1 INTRODUCTION AND STUDY DESIGN

The present study was designed specifically to collect information concerning recidivism rates for a sample of CRC men one year after their release into the community. It is an extension of the study of Community Resource Centres (CRCs) conducted by Ian Sone and Associates from 1974 to 1976 (See Sone, 1976).

The original report was based on information collected from 581 former CRC residents and a comparison group of 203 men involved in the Temporary Absence Programme (TAP). The sample of CRC residents included those men with a planned length of stay of more than five days who were admitted to and discharged from ten urban CRCs during an eighteen month period ending mid-December, 1975. In addition, one hundred of these men were involved in a follow-up interview designed to evaluate the former residents' community adjustment and to elicit their opinions with regard to their CRC experience.

The current sample includes the total sample of one hundred follow-up interviewees as well as an additional one hundred men randomly selected from the remaining 481 men in the original CRC group. A random sample of one hundred men was also selected from the original TAP comparison group. Thus, the current study is based on a total sample of 200 former CRC residents and 100 former TAP participants. Several checks were made on relevant data points to ensure that the present sample was representative of the original sample from the Sone study.

Recidivism data were collected for this sample one year after discharge into the community. Recidivism, in the present study, is defined as a further reconviction with or without reincarceration. The data were collected from information recorded on the F.P.S. reports released by the R.C.M.P. and from the Main Office files and the computerized Adult Information System (A.I.S.).

The information in the present study was generated by correlating the one year recidivism data with the previous information obtained from the Background Characteristics form, Discharge form and the follow-up interviews employed in the 1976 Sone study.

The Discharge form was designed to collect information about the personal problems experienced by residents in the CRC programme. A staff member who was acquainted with the residents' problems completed this questionnaire. The Background Characteristics form was completed by the researchers of the first study by the information provided to them from the files at Main Office.

2 DATA ANALYSIS

Data analysis was directed at determining factors related to recidivism. Descriptive data were compared across CRC and TAP groups. Statistical evaluation was accomplished by means of a chi square and t test. A chi square (χ^2) is a measure of the association between two variables. A t test is a measure of the standardized difference between the means or proportions of two groups. Three contingency tables in the present report (Tables 5, 8, and 9) examine the interrelationships among 3 factors. In these tables, the chi square was partitioned by Cochran's method to extract the individual factors most strongly related together. A further explanation of this method is provided in Appendix 11-A. The p or probability level is an indication of the statistical reliability or degree of confidence one can have in the results. Thus, a $p < .05$ indicates that five times out of 100 a statistic will achieve that value by chance and chance alone. Generally speaking, if a difference has a chance of occurring less than five times out of one hundred, the observed difference is judged as being a real difference. The notation 'ns' is used to indicate a statistically non-reliable result, or in this case, $p > .05$.

3 BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS

The CRC and TAP samples were highly similar in most demographic variables considered. However, the two groups differed in the number of first offenders involved in each programme. More of the TAP men tended to be first offenders than CRC men; 42% (N=42) vs. 26% (N=52), ($t=2.82$, $p < .01$). Generally, TAP men tended to be less involved in criminal activities prior to their programme initiation. Second, there was a statistically reliable difference in the average length of time presently being served; men in the CRCs were serving an average sentence of approximately 7.8 months, whereas men on the Temporary Absence Programme were serving a sentence of about 5.3 months ($t=3.52$, $p=.0005$). Although the average length of present sentence was significantly different for the two groups, the average number of present offences for which they were serving time was nearly the same for both groups (2.7 vs 2.3, $p=ns$). Finally, there was a smaller proportion of employed men in the CRCs than in the TAP sample who were occupied in the same job during their present sentence as they were prior to their incarceration (43.5% vs 70.8%, $\chi^2 = 15.17$, $p < .01$). Men in both programme samples were typically around 25 years of age, were single and had at least a grade 10 level of education.

TABLE 1

BACKGROUND PARAMETERS

	CRC			TAP			STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE
	\bar{X}	%	N	\bar{X}	%	N	
AGE (in years)	25.1		200	24.7		100	t=0.37 (ns)
MARITAL STATUS:							
SINGLE		55.8	111		58.5	55	$\chi^2=.39$ (ns)
MARRIED		31.2	62		30.9	29	
OTHER (UNKNOWN)		13.1	26 (1)		10.6	10 (6)	
EDUCATION:							
GRADE 9 OR LESS		39.3	77		34.8	31	$\chi^2=.8$ (ns)
GRADE 10 to 13		55.1	108		60.7	54	
POST SECONDARY (UNKNOWN)		5.6	11 (4)		4.5	4 (11)	
TYPE OF T.A.:							
EDUCATION		16.7	33		11.0	11	$\chi^2=1.7$ (ns)
EMPLOYMENT (VOLUNTEER)		83.3	165 (2)		89.0	89 (0)	
SAME JOB AS PRIOR TO INCARCERATION:							
YES		43.5	60		70.8	63	$\chi^2=15.7$ p<.01
NO		56.5	78		29.2	26	
(STUDENTS OR UNKNOWN)			(62)			(11)	
PROGRAMME COMPLETED:							
YES		82.0	164		92.0	92	t=2.31 p<.05
NO		18.0	36		8.0	8	
AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY IN PROGRAMME:	6.2 weeks		200	5.8 weeks		100	t=.775 (ns)
AVERAGE LENGTH OF PRESENT SENTENCE:	7.8 mos.		200	5.3 mos.		100	t=3.52 p=.0005
AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRESENT OFFENCES:	2.7		200	2.3		100	t=1.26 (ns)
NUMBER OF FIRST OFFENDERS:		26.0	52		42.0	42	t=2.28 p<.01
AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRIOR OFFENCES:*	6.2		148	5.0		58	t=1.14 (ns)
TOTAL AVERAGE OF PRIOR OFFENCES:	4.6		200	2.9		100	t=2.20 p=0.03

*Excluding those men with no prior offences (i.e. first offenders).

4 RECONVICTIONS

This section will examine a specific breakdown of the number and type of further offences committed by CRC recidivists, as well as, the dispositions received for these offences. These data were compared to the outcomes of the TAP sample.

Overall, sixty of the two hundred CRC men studied (30%) recidivated within a one year period after their discharge from the programme. This was not statistically different from the TAP comparison group wherein 38% (n=38) recidivated.

TABLE 2

RECIDIVISM BY CRC VS. TAP

RECIDIVATED	CRC		TAP	
	%	N	%	N
YES	30.0	60	38.0	38
NO	70.0	140	62.0	62
TOTALS	100.0	200	100.0	100

$$\chi^2 = 1.59 \text{ (ns)}$$

These figures compare with previously reported data where male first incarcerates at Guelph Correctional Centre between 1965-66 demonstrated a 34% recidivism rate within a one year period after their release (Carlson, 1973). Male first incarcerates who had served time at institutions in Brampton, Burtch or Guelph in the years 1970-72 demonstrated a 31% recidivism rate within a one year period after release (Gendreau, 1976).

The types of offences committed by recidivating CRC and TAP men are outlined in Table 3. The proportion of recidivating men who were convicted of the particular offence area are indicated by the percentages given in the second column. Means (\bar{X}) represent the average number of counts committed by recidivists from each offence area. Recidivists from the CRC sample committed an average of 1.7 offences which is not statistically different

from the average of 1.6 offences committed by the recidivating TAP sample ($t=0.70$, ns).

TABLE 3

TYPE OF OFFENCE

OFFENCE AREA	CRC			TAP		
	\bar{X} counts per recidivist within offence area	% of recidivists committing offence area		\bar{X} counts per recidivist within offence area	% of recidivists committing offence area	
	\bar{X} counts	%	N	\bar{X} counts	%	N
Property	2.38	40	(24)	1.89	47	(18)
Liquor	1.75	27	(16)	1.46	34	(13)
Public Order and Peace	1.33	35	(21)	1.33	16	(6)
Traffic	1.58	20	(12)	2.13	39	(15)
Drug	1.18	18	(11)	1.14	18	(7)
Parole Violation	1.00	12	(7)	1.00	18	(7)
Person	1.00	3	(2)	1.00	13	(5)
Other	4.00	3	(2)	1.00	8	(3)
TOTALS	1.71		(60)	1.57		(38)

The proportion of recidivists committing crimes in each offence area was about the same for both groups with the following exception; a larger proportion of CRC recidivists were guilty of crimes against public order and peace than TAP recidivists (35% vs 16%, $t=2.17$, $p<.05$) while more TAP recidivists were guilty of crimes against persons (13% vs 3%, $t=2.23$, $p<.05$) and traffic offences* (39% vs 20%, $t=2.18$, $p<.05$) than CRC recidivists.

* A total of 5 men from both recidivating samples were convicted of traffic offences exclusive of being convicted of any other offence areas.

The proportion of men who were reincarcerated versus the proportion of men who were reconvicted without being reincarcerated was about the same for the TAP and CRC samples. Overall, 80% (n=78) of all recidivists were reincarcerated while the remaining 20% (n=20) were reconvicted without being sentenced to an institution. Table 4 shows the proportion of recidivists within each study group who received at least one of the dispositions listed. Each disposition category does not represent a discrete group since it was possible for an individual to receive more than one disposition.

TABLE 4

DISPOSITIONS

DISPOSITION	CRC		TAP	
	% N/60	N	% N/38	N
Fines	0.0	0	5.3	2
Alternate Fine or Time	48.3	29	50.0	19
Probation	18.3	11	10.5	4
Suspended Sentence	8.3	5	2.6	1
Sentenced 1 to 30 days	26.7	16	28.9	11
Sentenced 31 days to 12 months	35.0	21	42.1	16
Over 1 year, under 2 yrs	5.0	3	10.5	4
Over 2 years	8.3	5	5.3	2

5 OUTCOME AND RELATED FACTORS

It has been suggested elsewhere that the proportion of participants who complete a Ministry programme could be used as another indicator of the success of a programme (Sone, 1976). In keeping with the first report of the Community Resource Centres, successful programme completion was defined as a resident's release from the CRC upon sentence expiry or by Ontario or National Parole. Residents who had their CRC passes revoked or withdrawn were not considered to have successfully completed the programme.

What initially appeared to be a strong relationship between programme completion and recidivism (Sone, 1976) did not persist in strength over time. Recidivism rates at the six month post-discharge period were two and one half times as great for those men who did not complete the programme than the rates for those who did complete their programme (24.4%, N=19 vs 9.5%, N=45, $t=4.81$, $p<.001$). However, one year after release, there was a decrease in this effect whereby the rate for those men who did not complete the programme was one and one half times as great as the rate for those who did complete the programme (41.7%, N=15 vs 27.4%, N=45, $t=1.69$, $p=.05$, 1-tailed). When the one year recidivism data were examined over the varying lengths of residency, some interesting relationships with programme completion were uncovered.

TABLE 5

PERCENT RECIDIVATING WITHIN LENGTH OF STAY
BY PROGRAMME COMPLETION

LENGTH OF STAY IN CRC	PROGRAMME COMPLETED				$\chi^2 =$
	YES		NO		
	% recidivating	N	% recidivating	N	
0 to 1 month	17.7	11/62	42.3	11/26	5.896, p<.02
over 1 month	33.3	34/102	40.0	4/10	0.180, p=ns

(χ^2 total = 6.076, $p<.05$)

Reliability of association between Programme Completion and recidivism; $\chi^2_{assoc} = 1.15$, $p=ns$. Reliability of combined effect on recidivism rates by Length of Stay interacting with programme completion; $\chi^2_{homog} = 4.93$, $p<.05$. (See appendix 11-A for a further discussion of the statistical technique employed in the analysis of these data.)

The significance of the findings reported in Table 5 must be attributed to the variable length of stay since it was found that the association between programme completion and recidivism alters with length of time in the programme. Overall, there was no reliable relationship between programme completion, by itself, with recidivism. However, when one

examines recidivism among residents who were in the programme for less than one month, there was a significant difference in recidivism rates between those who completed the programme and those men who did not (17.7% vs 42.3%). These two groups are not directly comparable in terms of isolating the effect of programme completion since the men not completing within the first month were affected by other factors that precipitate later recidivism. These factors will be discussed throughout the following section.

5-A FACTORS RELATED TO NON-COMPLETION

It is noted earlier that, prior to intervention, CRC men were typically more involved in criminal activities than the comparison group of TAP participants. However, this factor did not interfere with the probability of these men completing their planned length of stay in the CRC. The data presented in Table 6 indicate that programme completion was not associated with any evidentiary measures of prior criminal activity.

TABLE 6

CRIMINAL INVOLVEMENT BY PROGRAMME COMPLETION

CRIMINAL INVOLVEMENT FACTOR	PROGRAMME COMPLETED		t=
	YES	NO	
Average number of present offences	2.6	3.2	1.16, p=ns
Average Length of present sentence (months)	7.6	8.6	0.82, p=ns
Average number of prior offences (including first offenders)	4.5	4.9	0.30, p=ns

Most men who did not complete their CRC programme left within the first month. A total of 36 men (18%) had their CRC passes withdrawn or revoked. Of these, 26 left the programme within the first month. This constitutes 72.2% of the total non-completing CRC sample. The investigator

thought that the initial weeks in residence may have implicitly served as an informal adjustment period wherein seriously troubled residents, who were not well suited for the CRC programme, would have been returned to the institution. On the basis of this assumption, it was decided to investigate the staff's perception of each resident recorded during the initial investigation of CRCs. The staff reported five problem areas that each resident may have been experiencing at the time of his admission to the CRC. These included problems with interpersonal relations, associating with other known criminals, use of leisure time, drug or alcohol abstention and a number of financial areas. The cumulative results of these problem factors are grouped to form a three point index of "none" (0), "few" (1-2), or "many" (3-5) problems and were examined in relation to programme completion.

TABLE 7

NUMBER OF PROBLEMS BY PROGRAMME COMPLETION

NUMBER OF PROBLEM AREAS IDENTIFIED BY STAFF	PROGRAMME COMPLETED			
	YES		NO	
	%	N	%	N
None (0)	40.9	(67)	22.2	(8)
Few (1-2)	45.5	(73)	47.2	(17)
Many (3-5)	14.6	(24)	30.6	(11)
Totals	100.0	(164)	100.0	(36)

$$\chi^2=7.06, p<.05$$

Overall, most men were experiencing at least one or two problems. However, those who completed the programme tended to have fewer problems at the time of admission than those who did not complete the programme. A specific breakdown of these problem areas revealed that programme completion was often contingent on whether the men were able to make good use of leisure time. In addition, an examination of problems experienced by men at the time of discharge revealed that there was an unusually large number of men not completing the programme who were experiencing drug or alcohol problems. This observation is consistent

with previous findings, as reported in the initial study of CRCs, wherein 30.8% of those men who did not complete their programmes as planned, were returned to the parent institution because of their drinking or drug involvement (Sone, p.11).

Analysis of the data in Table 8 confirms that the number of problems among the men not completing the programme contributes to the probability of being returned to the institution within the first month of their stay in the CRC.

TABLE 8

PERCENT NOT COMPLETING THE PROGRAMME WITHIN
NUMBER OF PROBLEMS BY LENGTH OF STAY

NUMBER OF PROBLEMS	LENGTH OF STAY IN CRC		
	0-1 month % not completing N	over 1 month % not completing N	
None	15.2 (5/33)	7.1 (3/42)	1.27, ns
Few	32.6 (14/43)	6.4 (3/47)	10.05, p<.01
Many	58.3 (7/12)	17.4 (4/23)	6.12, p<.02

$$\chi^2_{\text{total}} = 10.38, p < .05$$

Reliability of Association between Length of Stay in CRC and Programme non-completion; $\chi^2_{\text{assoc}}=0.42, p=\text{ns}$. Reliability of combined effect on Programme non-completion rates by Number of Problems interacting with Length of Stay in CRC; $\chi^2_{\text{homog}}=9.96, p<.01$ (See appendix 11-A for a further discussion of the statistical technique employed in the analysis of these data).

There was no reliable difference detected in the proportion of men leaving over time among those men who were not experiencing any problems. Of those men with few or many problems, there was a significantly larger proportion leaving within the first month of residence in the CRC. After the first month in residence, the proportion of men being returned to the institution declined considerably. Furthermore, the number of problem areas experienced by residents was not related to programme completion after the first month. Similarly,

evidence of any problem factors, regardless of quantity, was also associated with recidivism rates among short term residents. Recidivism rates were not associated with a problem factor among the men who were in the CRCs for longer than one month (Table 9).

TABLE 9

PERCENT RECIDIVATING WITHIN PROBLEMS
BY LENGTH OF STAY

EVIDENCE OF ANY PROBLEMS	LENGTH OF STAY IN PROGRAMME			
	0-1 month		over 1 month	
	% recidivating	N	% recidivating	N
NO	12.1	(4/33)	26.2	(11/42)
YES	32.7	(18/55)	38.6	(27/70)
	$\chi^2 = 4.67, p < .05$		$\chi^2 = 1.8, p = ns$	

($\chi^2_{total} = 6.47, p < .05$)

Reliability of association between problems and recidivism; $\chi^2_{assoc} = 1.7, p = ns$. Reliability of combined effect on recidivism rates by Length of Stay interacting with evidence of any problems; $\chi^2_{homog} = 4.7, p < .05$. (See appendix 11-A for a further discussion of the statistical technique employed in the analysis of these data.)

To briefly recapitulate, the number of problems experienced by residents was associated with an early return to the institution prior to completing the programme. This would support the initial hypothesis of an informal screening period during the first month in residence at the CRC. The problem element among short term residents was also predictive of later recidivism. Evidence of long term residents having any problems was not associated with programme completion or recidivism.

The lack of an association between the problem index with relevant outcome factors among long term residents may, in part, be attributed to the inadequacy of a variable, such as *number of problems*, which is not sensitive to the severity of these problems. There are alternate explanations for a reduction in the impact of these problem areas over time. First, the reader is reminded that the five problem areas were identified by staff at the time the men were first ad-

mitted to the Centres. It would be expected that some type of corrective programme would be immediately initiated for these men. Therefore, long term residents, having had a greater opportunity for exposure to intervention, may have experienced some resolution of their problems. This assumption appears to be supported by the data presented in Table 10. It can be seen that short term residents received significantly less treatment of their problems than long term residents (68% vs 83%). On the other hand, the increased treatment rate among long term residents may not be simply a reflection of the opportunity afforded by time alone, but also may be related to the nature of these problems. The long term residents, having sustained the initial adjustment period, may have been men with less severe problems and, therefore, could be more readily managed within the rehabilitative scheme of the CRCs. By either explanation, the notion of a reduced problem factor among long term residents would be supported and, thereby, underscore the lack of an association between the problem element among long term residents and programme completion (Table 8) or later recidivism (Table 9).

TABLE 10

LENGTH OF STAY BY TREATMENT

LENGTH OF STAY IN CRC	PROBLEM AREA TREATED				100% = TOTAL # OF PROBLEMS WITHIN TIME FRAME
	%	YES N	%	NO N	
0 to 1 month	68.0	66	32.0	31	97
Over 1 month	83.0	122	17.0	25	147

$$\chi^2 = 7.39, p < .01$$

The rehabilitative programmes offered through the CRCs were directed at improving a resident's ability to cope with potential problem areas after his release into the community. With this goal in mind, measures were made of the staff's perceptions of the residents' future prospects in specific life skill areas, as well as their level of preparedness for future disappointments. These factors were compared between completing and non-completing CRC residents.

Staff evaluated each resident's future prospects as "strong", "weak" or "not important" in the areas of employment, alcohol or drug abstention, social relationships, frustration management and financial prospects. A frequency count was tallied, for each man, of the number of areas in which he was judged to have a weak prospect. Subjects were thereby classified on a continuum of "none", "few" (one or two) or "many" (three or more) poor prospects. This final index of poor prospects was found to be highly associated with programme completion.

TABLE 11

NUMBER OF WEAK PROSPECTS BY PROGRAMME COMPLETION

NUMBER OF WEAK PROSPECTS	PROGRAMME COMPLETED			
	YES		NO	
	%	N	%	N
None	58.5	(96)	11.1	(4)
Few	30.5	(50)	33.3	(12)
Many	11.0	(18)	55.6	(20)
Totals	100.0	164	100.0	36

$$\chi^2=44.23 \text{ } p<.01$$

As illustrated in Table 11, of those residents who completed their programme, 58.5% (96) had no weak prospects while 11% (18) had many. However, the majority of residents who did not complete their programme were judged by staff to have many poor prospects; 55.6% vs 11.1% having none. The staff's ratings of the residents' prospects in the community were found to be a reliable predictor of later recidivism. There was a highly reliable association between the present index of poor prospects and recidivism. This data is presented in Table 1 of Appendix 11-B.

Staff judged whether a resident was prepared to manage any possible disappointments concerning employment, personal relationships, accommodations, friends and financial areas. Positive responses were accumulated for each resident to form a final measure of preparedness; "slight" (0 to 2 areas), "moderate" (3 to 5) or "total"

(6). As demonstrated in Table 12, most of the residents (61.1%, N=22) who did not complete the programme were only slightly prepared to manage potential disappointments. Of those who completed the programme, 43.9% (72) were judged by staff to be totally prepared for future disappointments.

TABLE 12

LEVEL OF PREPARATION BY PROGRAMME COMPLETION

LEVEL OF PREPARATION	PROGRAMME COMPLETED			
	Yes		No	
	%	N	%	N
Slight	18.3	30	61.1	22
Moderate	37.8	62	22.2	8
Total	43.9	72	16.7	6
Totals	100.0	164	100.0	36

$$\chi^2=28.48 \text{ } p<.01$$

In summary, it was found that the majority of residents who did not complete their programmes, failed to adjust within the first month of their stay. The CRCs were able to manage the more criminally involved client they received since it was found that programme completion was not related to any measures of criminal involvement. It would appear as though the processes operating during the initial adjustment period within the first month were most sensitive to the number and types of problems experienced by the men. After the first month, the problems experienced by long term residents were no longer related to programme completion or recidivism. Alternate arguments were presented to explain the reduced problem factor among long term residents. The discussion was supported by the finding of a high "treatment" rate for the problems experienced by long term residents. In view of the inordinate number of problems among the sample of men not completing their programmes, it is not surprising to find these men were less prepared to manage life's disappointments after their release and that their prospects of coping with potential problems were quite poor. These extreme differences in the nature of men who completed their

CRC programme compared with those men who were screened out may account for the higher recidivism rate among non-completers (41.7%).

5-B RECIDIVISM AND THE SHORT TERM RESIDENT

In contrast to the foregoing discussion of the high recidivism rate among men not completing the programme, the data in Table 5 also demonstrated a significantly lower recidivism rate among men who completed their planned length of stay of one month or less. This information has been recreated in Table 13.

TABLE 13

LENGTH OF STAY IN PROGRAMME BY RECIDIVISM
(PROGRAMME COMPLETERS ONLY)

LENGTH OF STAY	RECIDIVATED				100%=
	%	Yes N	%	No N	
0-1 month	17.7	11	82.3	51	62
over 1 month	33.3	34	66.7	68	102

$$\chi^2=3.9 \quad p<.05$$

This small proportion of recidivists among those who completed the programme in less than one month may be attributed to some unique characteristics of these men. Typically, this group of men were less involved in criminal activities prior to admission to the CRC programme.

The length of sentence has been used as a measure of the severity of an inmate's present criminal behaviour. Indeed, it has been confirmed in the present study of CRC and TAP participants that the length of time presently being served is generally related to continuing criminal behaviour after discharge. The relationship between these two factors is illustrated in Table 14. Men who were sentenced to serve longer periods of time were more inclined to recidivate than short term inmates.

TABLE 14

RECIDIVISM BY AVERAGE LENGTH OF PRESENT SENTENCE

RECIDIVATED	AVERAGE LENGTH OF PRESENT SENTENCE	
	CRC	TAP
Yes	10.1 mos.	7.3 mos.
No	6.8 mos.	4.0 mos.
	($t=3.60$, $p=.0004$)	($t=3.15$, $p<.01$)

Generally, it was found that the length of stay in the CRC programme is a function of the length of sentence given to inmates for their present offences. The relationship between these two factors among the men who successfully completed their CRC programme is shown in the following table.

TABLE 15

LENGTH OF STAY IN CRC PROGRAMME BY AVERAGE LENGTH
OF TIME SENTENCED (PROGRAMME COMPLETERS ONLY)

LENGTH OF STAY IN CRC PROGRAMME	AVERAGE LENGTH OF PRESENT SENTENCE
0 to 1 month	5.6 months
1 to 2 months	7.4 months
over 2 months	11.1 months
	($F=11.06$, $p<.001$)

Short term CRC residents (0 to 1 month) were serving relatively shorter sentences. Since the length of sentence interacts with the probability of later recidivism, it would be expected that short term CRC residents would be less inclined to later recidivate.

A further indication of the degree of present criminal involvement is the number of offences for which the inmates were presently serving time. This factor was also found to be a reliable predictor of recidivism after release from CRC and TAP programmes.

TABLE 16

RECIDIVISM BY AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRESENT OFFENCES

RECIDIVATED	AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRESENT OFFENCES	
	CRC	TAP
Yes	4.2 offences	3.1 offences
No	2.1 offences ($t=5.2$, $p<.0001$)	1.8 offences ($t=2.75$, $p<.01$)

The number of offences of which the CRC men were convicted at the time of their admission to the programme varies directly with the length of stay in the CRC programme.

TABLE 17

LENGTH OF STAY IN CRC PROGRAMME BY AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRESENT OFFENCES (PROGRAMME COMPLETERS ONLY)

LENGTH OF STAY IN CRC PROGRAMME	AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRESENT OFFENCES
0 to 1 month	2.1 offences
over 1 month	3.0 offences ($t=2.02$, $p=.045$)

Short term residents were, on the average, serving time for a relatively fewer number of offences. Consistent with the aforementioned observations, the probability of these men recidivating would be diminished.

Finally, the severity of an inmates' criminal history was measured by the number of convictions experienced prior to his present sentence and CRC intervention. There was a reliable difference in the proportion of first offenders in the CRC and TAP samples of men completing their programmes; 27% (N=45) vs 41% (N=40) respectively ($t=2.24$, $p=.025$). When the number of first offenders was weighted into the measure of prior criminality, it was found that the average number of prior offences the men had committed was a reliable predictor of continued criminal involvement after release into the community.

TABLE 18

RECIDIVISM BY AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRIOR
OFFENCES (PROGRAMME COMPLETERS ONLY)

RECIDIVATED	AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRIOR OFFENCES	
	CRC	TAP
Yes	7.1 offences	5.0 offences
No	3.5 offences ($t=3.51$, $p=.0001$)	1.6 offences ($t=3.4$, $p=.0034$)

However, the relationship between these two factors does not help us in our understanding of the relatively low recidivism rate among short term residents since it was found that the average number of prior offences was about the same for all the men, regardless of the length of time they stayed in the Centres.

In summary, the decreased recidivism rate among short term residents (17.7%) can be attributed to the inmates' relatively moderate degree of immediate criminal involvement prior to their CRC admission. However, it cannot be stated at this time that the degree of criminal involvement, prior to the immediate convictions, would contribute to a reduced recidivism rate for these men since the degree of prior criminal involvement was about the same for this group as long term residents.

5-C A FINAL COMMENT ON OUTCOME

As a final comment to this section, a comparison was made of the recidivism rates within the CRC and TAP samples. The data presented in Table 19 excludes all those men who did not complete their respective programmes. It was previously noted that most non-completing CRC men experienced a very brief exposure to the programme and, therefore, the programme could not be expected to have had any impact on them. Moreover, these men had demonstrated characteristics that were not typical of the average CRC resident. This would suggest that programme evaluation, in terms of recidivism, should be studied only with reference to men who completed their programmes.

TABLE 19

RECIDIVISM BY CRC VS TAP
(PROGRAMME COMPLETERS ONLY)

RECIDIVATED	CRC		TAP	
	%	N	%	N
Yes	27.4	45	37.0	34
No	72.6	119	63.0	58
Total	100.0	164	100.0	92

$$\chi^2=2.08, p=ns$$

The statistical analysis of the data in Table 19 implies that there is no reliable difference in the recidivism rates of CRC and TAP men. However, in consideration of the factors that contribute to recidivism, one would expect a slightly lower recidivism rate for TAP men rather than a 10% higher rate over the CRC sample. To wit, length of present sentence, number of current and prior offences were all slightly deflated in the TAP sample compared with the CRC group. Moreover, by removing first offenders from the two samples of men completing their respective programmes, the average number of prior offences committed by TAP men was about 1 1/2 less offences than CRC men (4.8 vs 6.3 offences respectively).

The foregoing would imply that TAP men were relatively less involved in criminal activities than the CRC men. From this, one would have expected a reduced recidivism rate for TAP men as compared to CRC men, however the reverse occurred.

6 EMPLOYMENT AND FINANCES

In the total sample of men who were employed during their CRC stay (N=138), those who maintained the same job, while on programme, which they had prior to incarceration (N=60) were least inclined to recidivate (13% recidivism rate, N=8). Men who were occupied in a different job than that which they had prior to incarceration were inclined to a much higher recidivism rate (40%, N=31). This same pattern was evident in the follow-up sample* wherein 15% (N=5) recidivated among those who maintained the same job, whereas 36% (N=15) recidivated among those who were occupied in different jobs during their CRC stay (See Table 2 in appendix 11-B).

With regard to the post-release employment situation, recidivism was also related to when the men obtained the jobs they were occupied in at the time of the follow-up interview. The highest proportion of recidivists were those men who had obtained their present jobs by some arrangements made while in the institution (71.4%, N=5). Men whose jobs were arranged while in the CRC's demonstrated a relatively low recidivism rate (22.2%, N=2). Consistent with the aforementioned observation of job consistency, those men who were occupied in a job they had acquired prior to incarceration demonstrated the smallest recidivism rate (4.0%, N=1).

TABLE 20

RECIDIVISM BY WHEN OBTAINED POST RELEASE JOB

RECIDIVATED	BEFORE INCARCERATION		ARRANGED WHILE IN INSTITUTION		ARRANGED WHILE IN CRC		AFTER RELEASE	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	4.0	1	71.4	5	22.2	2	22.7	5
No	96.0	24	28.6	2	77.8	7	77.3	17
Total	100.0	25	100.0	7	100.0	9	100.0	22

$$\chi^2=15.32, p<.01$$

* The reader is reminded that the sample size of men receiving follow-up interviews was 100.

The notion of job consistency, as a factor related to recidivism, is intrinsically associated with measures of employment stability studied in relation to recidivism. The average number of weeks the men had been employed in their most recent job was 63.2. It is interesting to note the large difference between recidivists and non-recidivists in the average number of weeks on the job:

recidivists = 14.3 weeks on job
 non-recidivists = 76.0 weeks on job
 (t=3.20, df=51, p<.01)

The number of weeks a man was able to stay with the same employer is an indication of the stability of an individual's work history. In addition, all men who were not students after discharge were specifically asked to rate their employment history as "good", "fair" or "poor". A statistically reliable relationship was found between this self rating and recidivism.

TABLE 21

RECIDIVISM BY EMPLOYMENT HISTORY

RECIDIVATED	PERCEIVED QUALITY OF EMPLOYMENT HISTORY					
	Good		Fair		Poor	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	16.0	8	40.0	4	52.6	10
No	84.0	42	60.0	6	47.4	9
Total	100.0	50	100.0	10	100.0	19

$$\chi^2=10.04, p<.01$$

It should be noted that most men who were employed after their release from the CRCs, perceived their employment history to be good (72%, N=50). The initial investigators of the CRCs rated the follow-up interviewees post-discharge employment situation. The final community adjustment score of "good", "fair", or "poor" was highly related to recidivism.

TABLE 22

RECIDIVISM BY POST-DISCHARGE EMPLOYMENT SITUATION

RECIDIVATED	POST-DISCHARGE EMPLOYMENT SITUATION					
	Good		Fair		Poor	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	14.8	8	40.0	8	50.0	13
No	85.2	46	60.0	12	50.0	13
Total	100.0	54	100.0	20	100.0	26

$$\chi^2=12.02 \text{ } p=.003$$

Specifically, it was found that recidivism rates were highest among men who were unemployed at the time of the follow-up interview (56.3%, N=9). Students ranked the second highest recidivism rate (33.3%, N=7), while men who were employed in the community had the lowest recidivism rate (20.6%, N=13) ($\chi^2=8.1$, $p<.05$). It is interesting to note that the men's post-discharge employment situation was highly related to the probability of recidivism however, a community adjustment score of their financial adequacy was not related to recidivism. At the time of the follow-up interview, 52% (N=52) of the men reported they had been experiencing some financial problems during their stay at the CRC. In spite of this, over one half (N=51) of the men reported that their financial situation improved during their stay, whereas only 2% (N=2) felt their finances had deteriorated during their stay. There was a total of 63 men employed after their release into the community within the group receiving follow-up interviews. The interviewees were earning an average wage of \$4.82 per hour (SD=\$1.45/hr) and were working an average of 40.3 hours per week (SD=6.9 hours/week). Almost half of the employed men (42.9%, N=27) were hired as skilled labourers.

In summary, the data indicated that the CRC programme is most effective with men who had a good employment history and especially with those men who were able to maintain, during their stay in the CRC and after their release, the same job they had prior to incarceration.

7 SOME MAJOR FACTORS RELATED TO RECIDIVISM

Several additional variables were found to be related to recidivism rates one year after discharge into the community. The following point-summary highlights these findings.

7-A INTERPERSONAL PROBLEMS AT THE TIME OF ADMISSION:

At the time of a resident's discharge from the CRC, the staff were asked to report whether the individual resident had experienced problems with his interpersonal relations prior to his admission to the CRC. Nineteen percent (N=38) of the men studied were identified by staff as having this problem. The results of the staff's evaluation were found to be significantly related to later recidivism rates. Those men who were identified with this problem had twice as high a recidivism rate as those men without the problem (50%, N=19, vs. 25%, N=40).

7-B EMOTIONAL HEALTH:

Most men in the follow-up sample reported they were presently under stress (60%, N=60). Stress per se was related to recidivism, however, a resident's ability to manage his stress problems was not related to recidivism. The initial researcher's final community adjustment rating of the men's post-discharge emotional health was found to be related to recidivism. Forty-four percent (N=11) of those men who were described as having poor emotional health recidivated. This compares with a 9% recidivism rate among men described as being in good emotional health ($\chi^2=11.23$, $p=.004$).

7-C USE OF LEISURE TIME:

At the time of the follow-up interview, 19% (N=19) of the men reported that they had been bored during their stay in the CRC and 10% (N=10) of the interviewees stated that they were presently bored. These factors were not, by themselves, related to recidivism. However, when the researchers calculated a final community adjustment score concerning the men's use of leisure time after their release into the community, an association was found with recidivism. Men who were making poor use of leisure time were over three times more likely to recidivate as those who were making good use of their spare time (poor - 50.6%, N=7; fair - 41.2%, N=14; good - 15.4%, N=8; $\chi^2=10.13$, $p=.006$).

7-D DRUG PROBLEMS AT THE TIME OF DISCHARGE:

The CRC staff identified 14% (N=27) of the CRC study sample as having a drug problem at the time of their admission to the programme. Only 9% (N=18) of the total sample had a drug problem upon release from the programme. The persistence of this drug problem at discharge was highly related to the probability of recidivating since 72% (N=13) of these men recidivated whereas only 25% (N=46) of those men who were not experiencing this problem later recidivated. Furthermore, most men who were experiencing a drug problem were diverted from the Community Resource Centres within the first month of their stay in the programme (See page 11). This might, in part, account for the exceedingly high recidivism rate within this group.

7-E PROBATION AND PAROLE RECORD:

In concordance with the observation that the degree of prior criminal involvement is directly related to the probability of recidivism, it was also found that evidence of a prior probation or parole record was also related to recidivism. One half of the CRC study sample had a probation record. These men were more than one and one half times as likely to recidivate than those who had no such record (37%, N=37 vs 23%, N=23, $\chi^2=4.22$, $p<.05$). Likewise, 19% (N=38) of the men had a parole record and this factor was also highly associated with recidivism rates; 53% (N=20) of the men with a parole record recidivated, whereas only 25% recidivated within the group without a parole record ($\chi^2=10.15$, $p<.01$). Whether the men's probation or parole record had been successful or not was not related to recidivism.

8 RESIDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE CRCs

The first study reported a general overview of the staff's and residents' ratings of the atmosphere in the Centres. The information had been provided during the time of the men's stay in the Centre by completing the Centre Information Form. This form was designed such that respondents were compelled to choose between 'true' or 'false' responses to a series of statements. At this time it was found that most men, especially those who completed the programme, had a positive perception of the Centres (71.1%, N=337). One hundred men participated in a follow-up interview a few months after their discharge into the community. At this time, the men were, once again, given the opportunity to express their feelings and perceptions of the CRCs to the researchers. The following information provides a detailed outline of the men's opinions given after their CRC experience.

8-A UTILITY OF CENTRES' ASSISTANCE:

Eighty-one percent acknowledged that help was usually available when needed while at the CRC whereas only 2% stated that assistance was rarely available. Of the 14 men who received some form of intervention for their alcohol problems during their stay in the CRC, 11 men (79%) stated that the intervention had been of some help during their stay. After their release into the community, 5 of these men (45%) reported that they were still able to better control their alcohol problem. Eighty-five percent of the men stated that CRCs had been of some help to their overall adjustment in the community after their discharge. Eighty-two percent indicated that the CRC had probably fulfilled its function as a bridge between institutional life and community life. Sixty-two percent went as far as to say that the CRCs may have been responsible for improving their chances of success after discharge.

8-B CRCs VS JAILS:

When residents compared CRC programmes with those offered by the jails, 59% felt a wider range of facilities were available either in the CRC itself or as a result of its accessibility to community based programmes. Only 28% stated that the facilities available either in or through the Centres were not as good as those offered by larger institutions. Ninety-two percent reported that staff-resident relations were better in a CRC than in the jails while only 1% stated that they were worse.

8-C UTILITY OF COMMUNITY RESOURCES:

Residents' perceptions were ambivalent toward the utility of the community resources they used. A total of 74% of the follow-up sample (N=74) had made use of the community resources available to them. Of these, over half (54%, N=40) said that participation in community resources had been a waste of time. An additional 16% (N=12) experienced mixed feelings whereas only 30% (N=22) felt the community resources were very useful. Ironically, this generally negative experience reported by the residents, contrasts with their general perceptions. Over half the people supported the community resources by stating that they might be very useful for other ex-offenders (61%, or 51 of the 83 who responded).

8-D EFFECT ON INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS:

Ninety-eight percent (N=98) of the men reported that incarceration had at least some disruptive effect on their interpersonal relations. Of these, 53% (N=52) stated that this disruption reached serious levels. However, of those

men who reported these disruptive effects, 91% (N=89) stated that the CRCs reduced this disruption. During the follow-up interview, 15% of the residents reported they were presently experiencing interpersonal problems. This is a reduction from 25% of the men reporting they had been experiencing problems during their stay in the CRC.

9 DISCUSSION

In the past, there has been a certain amount of controversy with regard to the identification of the target population with whom the CRCs should deal. Implicitly, this issue is basic to the goals and underlying philosophy of the Centres. Originally, it was assumed that the CRCs should be problem-oriented agencies that would provide counselling and/or treatment for offenders on a long term basis, making use of their own staff resources as well as the services provided by counselling agencies available in the community.

However, the original investigator of the CRCs found that the Centres were being used extensively by short term residents who only required pre-release planning. Sone (1976), therefore, recommended that a separate facility be provided for short term residents in need of pre-release planning vis-a-vis treatment. However, the Ministry felt it was not economically feasible to establish a new programme and there was some concern that the removal of these men from the Centres would result in an unacceptable reduction in occupancy rates in the CRCs.

The findings of the present study sheds more light on this issue of target populations. The CRCs were providing services for three identifiable groups of clients: short term residents seeking pre-release planning, long term residents requiring some form of intervention for the problems they experience, and a third group of men who were continuing at jobs they were employed in prior to being incarcerated. Each of these groups will be considered separately in the following discussion.

Short term residents (those remaining in the CRCs for less than one month) were admitted to the Centres for the exclusive purpose of pre-release planning. For these men, the Centres served as a bridge between the institution and the community by assisting the men in finding accommodations, jobs, etc. Typically, these men were less involved in criminal activities prior to intervention than the longer term resident seeking help for his problems. The counselling function of the Centres was de-emphasized for these men. The data revealed that a relatively smaller proportion of the problems experienced by these men received any form of intervention in the form of treatment during their brief stay in the CRCs. The outcome data for short term residents would justify the use of the Centres in this capacity since these men demonstrated one of the lowest recidivism rates studied (17.7%). Even in the early stages of their establishment, the

Community Resource Centres were proving to be useful and successful in their dealings with these men.

A second group of men were those who were admitted to the Centres for the purpose of receiving help for their problems. These men were relatively more involved in criminal activities prior to intervention. A large proportion of the problems experienced by these men received some form of "treatment". By the time of discharge, the problems experienced by these men had less of an impact in predicting outcome (i.e. recidivism and programme completion). It was argued that the reduced problem factor among these men connotes (1) the effect of prolonged treatment or (2) the results of a critical adjustment period within the system wherein seriously troubled residents disqualified themselves from continued CRC participation within the first month of their stay. The system adjusted itself for the management of long term residents requiring intervention that was within the scope of the CRCs.

A third group of residents, not necessarily exclusive of the prior two groups, were those men admitted to the Centres in order that they might continue working at jobs they were employed in prior to incarceration. In this capacity the CRCs provide a viable alternative to intermittent sentencing in cases where the judge feels the convicted man needs to maintain his contacts with the community and yet is in need of a greater degree of supervision than that afforded by intermittent sentences. Until now, this role of the CRCs has not been regarded as a discrete function and yet 43% (N=60) of the men who were employed during their stay in the CRC were continuing their regular jobs. Of all groups studied in this report, these men had the lowest recidivism rate (13%). The importance of job stability cannot be overstated. The findings indicate that financial difficulties after discharge were not related to continuing criminal behaviour, however, having a job after release was highly related to recidivism. Similarly, Renner (1978) reported that, among probationers, the existence of a job was important, and not the status of an individual's job, when predicting outcome. Furthermore, he states that: "...probationers who were employed full time at the end of their probation period were judged to be successes in 82.6% of the cases. The success rate is a function of both current employment status and the amount of time one has spent on the job" (1978, p. 10-1). These findings are consistent with previous reports where Gendreau et. al. have stated that "experience in the work force appears to be a very critical factor [when predicting recidivism]" (Gendreau, Madden & Leipziger, 1977, p.17). In view of the effect the men's post-discharge employment situation had on recidivism, the Centre's emphasis on maintaining job stability should be considered an essential role of the CRCs.

A second issue, worthy of note, is the unexpected observation of a high recidivism rate among former TAP participants one year after their release into the community (38%). This finding is noteworthy for two reasons. First, it was reported by Crispino (1974) that only 1 out of 40 individuals (2.5%) on the Temporary Absence Programme recidivated within a 7½ to 8½

month period after discharge and that none of an additional 29 TAP participants recidivated within the first few months after release. Second, TAP men demonstrated a higher recidivism rate than the CRC sample in spite of their lesser degree of criminal involvement prior to intervention. Although it is consoling to know that the CRCs were, on the basis of recidivism data, at least as successful as other Ministry programmes, it is very disconcerting to observe such a relatively high recidivism rate among former TAP participants. Based on the information available about this group, one would expect a much lower recidivism rate for TAP men.

A final issue, of no less importance, is concerned with earlier criticisms of the CRCs accusing the Centres of not making adequate use of community resources, and that many residents harboured a negative attitude toward such organizations. This issue largely depends on one's definition of community resources since it was found that a large proportion of men reported that they had been in contact with community resources during their stay in the Centres (74%). However, the majority of these men were referring to mandatory "services" that came under the jurisdiction of the justice system (i.e. probation and parole). Although this would justify the above criticism, the reader is reminded that a large number of men do not reside at the CRCs for the purpose of treatment or intervention. Of those men who did remain in the Centres for an extended period of time, a large proportion of the problem areas these men experienced received "treatment" either within the Centre itself or in community. Most men expressed positive statements concerning the availability of assistance during their stay in the Centres and felt the CRCs had provided a worthwhile function towards the adjustment of inmates into the community.

References

- Carlson, K.A. Some characteristics of recidivists in an Ontario institution for adult male first incarcerates. Canadian Journal of Criminology & Corrections, 1973, 15, 1-15.
- Crispino, Leonard. The Temporary Absence Programme For Employment: A study of Benefits, Toronto, Ontario: Ontario Ministry of Correctional Services, May, 1974.
- Gendreau, P., Leipziger, M. Recidivism and its Measurement in Ontario, Toronto, Ontario: Ontario Ministry of Correctional Services, December, 1976.
- Gendreau, P., Madden, P., Leipziger, M. Norms and Recidivism for First Incarcerates: Implications for Programming, Toronto, Ontario: Ontario Ministry of Correctional Services, November, 1977.
- Renner, John. The Adult Probationer in Ontario, Toronto, Ontario: Ontario Ministry of Correctional Services, January, 1978.
- Ian Sone and Associates, Ltd. Community Resource Centre Study, Toronto, Ontario: Ontario Ministry of Correctional Services, December, 1976.

APPENDIX 11-A

COCHRAN'S METHOD OF PARTITIONING THE CHI-SQUARE

Several contingency tables in this report are presented three dimensionally; that is, two independent variables (a dichotomous group under varied conditions) were studied in relation to a binomial, dependent variable (see Tables 5, 8, and 9). Analysis of these tables was accomplished by using Cochran's method for partitioning the Chi Square. This technique allows the researcher to examine the differences in proportional frequencies within each cell. Firstly, a χ^2_i was determined between the two groups under each unique condition. Secondly, an overall comparison was made between the two groups by holding the effect of the various conditions constant (χ^2_{assoc}). This statistic determined the reliability of the association between the groups and the dependent variable. Finally, consideration was given to the overall effect of the various conditions interacting with the groups on the dependent variable ($\chi^2_{\text{homogenous}}$). This statistic measured the reliability of any changes in the association between the groups and the dependent variable over the various conditions.

APPENDIX 11-B

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES

TABLE 1

RECIDIVISM BY NUMBER OF POOR PROSPECTS

NUMBER OF WEAK PROSPECTS	RECIDIVATED			
	Yes		No	
	%	N	%	N
None (0)	36.7	22	55.7	78
Few (1-2)	30.0	18	31.4	44
Many (3-6)	33.3	20	12.9	19
100% =		60		140

$$\chi^2=12.34, p<.01$$

TABLE 2

RECIDIVISM BY SAME JOB

(TOTAL CRC SAMPLE) SAME JOB AS PRIOR TO INCARCERATION				RECIDIVATED	(FOLLOW-UP SAMPLE) SAME JOB AS PRIOR TO INCARCERATION			
Yes		No			Yes		No	
%	N	%	N		%	N	%	N
13.3	8	39.7	31	Yes	14.7	5	35.7	15
86.7	52	60.3	47	No	85.3	29	64.3	27
100.0	60	100.0	78	Totals	100.0	34	100.0	42

$$\chi^2=10.4, p<.01$$

$$\chi^2=3.3, ns$$