

PROJECT-159

THE COMMUNITY SERVICE ORDER PROGRAMME IN ONTARIO

2. PARTICIPANTS AND THEIR PERCEPTIONS

by

Marian Polonoski

Planning and Research Branch



Ontario

MINISTRY OF
CORRECTIONAL
SERVICES

Honourable
Gordon Walker
Minister
Glenn R. Thompson
Deputy Minister

FEBRUARY, 1980

68360
copy 1

MINISTRY OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO



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

PROJECT STAFF

Research Assistants.....Silvia Hermann
Larry Earlix

February, 1980

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author gratefully acknowledges the cooperation received from the Community Service Order Co-ordinators and their staff who have given their support to this research and who conducted the interviews with the probationers.

Special thanks is also extended to those Community Service Order programme participants who willingly volunteered their time to be involved in this study.

NCJRS

JUN 3 1980

ACQUISITIONS

ADMINISTRATIVE ABSTRACT

A research investigation was undertaken in January of 1978 to describe the Community Service Order programme operating in 12 pilot project areas throughout Ontario. The first report to emerge from this study documented data collected on 689 probationers issued a CSO during the first year of operation of the programme in these areas. This second report focuses on a sub-sample of probationers who completed their Orders during 1979 and who were subsequently given a Debriefing Interview. The social histories, experiences in and perceptions of these CSO programme participants are described.

It would appear, from these data, that the CSO programme is successfully providing both an alternative sentencing disposition and a positive experience to offenders. It must be noted, however, that these findings are tentative. The study population was limited, comprised of only 192 probationers who completed their Orders. Because of the sample selection, it may also be more representative of the successfully completed cases.

The majority of the participants were male, approximately 22 years old and single. They were also fairly stable, in terms of education and employment. Most had been sentenced for a single offence which was usually property-related, such as Theft Under \$200, Break and Enter or Theft Over \$200. They had been sentenced by the Judiciary to a mean of 13.7 months of probation, in addition to their CSO assignments, which ranged from ten to 400 hours. The mean assignment was 65.8 hours.

On the whole, probationers felt they had been treated fairly by the Courts. One-third of the sample, however, thought they would have gone to jail if they had not agreed to the CSO and seventy percent asserted that the CSO experience would help to keep them out of further trouble with the law.

Probationers tended to remain at one community placement throughout their work assignment, and at least half performed manual labour types of jobs while there. The majority enjoyed their placements and expressed having been treated neither differently from other personnel nor unfairly by the community agencies. A total of 11,778 hours of free service was provided by this small group of offenders. Only 2.9% had been reconvicted of an offence during the performance of their CSO assignments and 97% completed their Orders successfully.

Several probationers reported that their CSO assignments had had an impact on their lives, particularly on their work, leisure interests, social activities and general attitudes.

In addition, a large proportion said their families and/or friends had shown some interest in their community service work as well. In terms of perceived benefits of the CSO programme, participants most often cited having gained some personal satisfaction from their work efforts. The most commonly mentioned drawback, however, was that they had to spend the time they normally shared with their families, at work or at school, working on their CSO. Half of those who gave recommendations for improving the programme suggested that it be expanded.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	i
ADMINISTRATIVE ABSTRACT.....	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
I INTRODUCTION.....	1
II METHODOLOGY.....	2
A. FOCUS OF THE RESEARCH.....	2
B. THE SAMPLE.....	2
C. INSTRUMENTS.....	3
D. PROCEDURE OF THE RESEARCH DESIGN.....	3
III RESULTS.....	4
A. THE CSO PROBATIONERS DEBRIEFED.....	4
1. Demographic Background.....	4
2. School and Work History.....	7
3. Criminal History.....	7
a. Prior Convictions.....	7
b. The Conviction Leading to the CSO Disposition.....	7
4. Probationers' Perceptions of Judicial Treatment.....	8
B. THE COMMUNITY SERVICE PLACEMENTS.....	11
1. Description of the Placements.....	12
2. Probationers' Perceptions of their CSO Placements.....	12
3. Probationers' Perceptions of their Treatment at Placements.....	18

	<u>Page</u>
C. THE IMPACT OF THE COMMUNITY SERVICE EXPERIENCE.....	19
1. The Performance of the Community Service Assignment.....	20
2. Impact of Community Service on Probationers' Lifestyle.....	23
D. PROBATIONERS' PERCEPTIONS OF CSO AS A SENTENCING OPTION.....	25
IV DISCUSSION.....	29
A. PERCEPTIONS AND EXPERIENCES OF PROBATIONERS IN RELATION TO THE OBJECTIVES OF THE ONTARIO CSO PROGRAMME.....	29
V REFERENCES.....	36
APPENDIX.....	37

LIST OF TABLES

<u>TABLE</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. DISTRIBUTION OF CSO PROBATIONERS INTERVIEWED IN 12 PILOT PROJECT AREAS.....	2
2. AGE DISTRIBUTION OF PROBATIONERS AT CSO DISPOSITION.....	5
3. MARITAL STATUS OF CSO PROBATIONERS DEBRIEFED.....	5
4. HIGHEST SCHOOL GRADE ACHIEVED.....	6
5. EDUCATIONAL INVOLVEMENT AT CSO DISPOSITION.....	6
6. EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT CSO DISPOSITION.....	6
7. PROBATION TERMS OF CSO PROBATIONERS DEBRIEFED.....	9
8. HOURS ASSIGNED TO CSO PROBATIONERS.....	9
9. TASKS PERFORMED BY CSO PROBATIONERS DEBRIEFED.....	13
10. WORK DONE BY PROBATIONER WAS WORK CHOSEN.....	16
11. TIME TAKEN TO PERFORM COMMUNITY SERVICE ASSIGNMENT.....	21
12. WHEN PROBATIONER USUALLY WORKED ON CSO.....	21
13. CONTINUATION OF CONTACT WITH AGENCIES BY PROBATIONERS AFTER CSO COMPLETION.....	22

I INTRODUCTION

This report is the second in a series dealing with the use of the Community Service Order (CSO) as a sentencing option in Ontario. The original purpose of the research was to describe the types of offenders issued CSOs by the courts in selected pilot project areas, the kind of services they provided to the communities and how they fared in the performance of their Orders. The first report to emerge from this investigation (Polonoski, 1979) documented data collected on 689 probationers issued a CSO during the first year of operation of the CSO programme, in the pilot areas. This second report focuses on a sub-sample of probationers who completed their CSO requirements during 1979, and describes their social histories, experiences in and perceptions of the CSO programme. The views of the participants themselves are an important element in the determination of the impact of the community-based programme on offenders.

The results of this second phase of the research are also discussed in relation to the stated objectives of the Community Service Order Programme in Ontario.

II METHODOLOGY

A. FOCUS OF THE RESEARCH

The research phase described in this document focuses on a sub-sample of probationers issued a CSO in 12 pilot project areas in Ontario and their perceptions of the CSO programme.

B. THE SAMPLE

The study population of this phase of the research was comprised of a sub-sample of 192 probationers who were issued CSOs in the twelve pilot project areas. It was anticipated that each project area co-ordinator would administer a Debriefing Interview to the first twenty probationers who completed their hours, under whatever circumstances, between January 1, 1979 and June 31, 1979. By the end of June, however, insufficient interviews were received, and the study phase was extended to the end of September, 1979. The distribution of CSO probationers who were given the Debriefing Interview is indicated in Table 1. As can be seen, the overall number of probationers interviewed is less than anticipated, while three project areas are slightly over-represented.

TABLE 1

DISTRIBUTION OF CSO PROBATIONERS
INTERVIEWED IN 12 PILOT PROJECT AREAS

<u>Pilot Project Area</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Peterborough/Lindsay	28	14.6
Belleville	24	12.5
Hamilton/Wentworth	23	12.0
Kitchener/Cambridge	20	10.4
Scarborough	17	8.9
St. Catharines	16	8.3
Brampton/Peel	16	8.3
Thunder Bay	14	7.3
Windsor	13	6.8
Oshawa/Ajax	8	4.2
London	7	3.6
Kenora	6	3.1
Total	192	100.0

In most cases, this group of probationers were interviewed when all their community service requirements had been met, therefore they are very likely more representative of the successfully completed CSO cases.

C. INSTRUMENTS

The data compiled in this report were collected on three instruments: a Client Information Face Sheet (C.I.F.S.), a CWO Experience Form and the Debriefing Interview. The first instrument, the Client Information Face Sheet, is a formalized information tool completed on a routine basis by Probation Services, when an offender is placed on probation. It describes the offender's social-demographic history, lists the offender's convictions and dispositions related to the probation order and outlines any additional facts which may be of significance to the Probation Services. Research incorporated this formalized instrument into the CSO study's data collection.

The second data collection instrument, the CWO Experience Form, was designed specially for use in the CSO research study. It was designed and pre-tested with the cooperation of the local pilot project co-ordinators. Later, it was integrated into the CSO process in each of the project areas as a routine information document. The CWO Experience Form measured the probationer's experience of performing community service as a court disposition. It recorded the specifications of the probationers' CSOs, the service provided by them, their community placements, the beneficiaries of the community service, community contacts made during the community service, and any criminal activity during the CSO.

The third instrument, the Debriefing Interview, was also designed and pre-tested with the assistance of the local CSO co-ordinators. It surveyed the probationers' perceptions of the CSO programme and their feelings about their treatment while in it. It also solicited any problems they may have encountered in the performance of their hours and any recommendations for programme improvement.

D. PROCEDURE OF THE RESEARCH DESIGN

When an offender was placed on probation with the CSO condition, in a pilot project area, the Probation Services submitted a copy of her/his Client Information Face Sheet to the researcher. The CWO Experience Form was dispatched by the project area co-ordinator upon the completion of the probationer's CSO. A CSO was considered as completed with the termination of the offender's community service in a project area (i.e. the assigned hours were achieved; the case was transferred out of a project area; the case was breached). The Debriefing Interview schedule was administered by the co-ordinator or his/her staff when the probationer completed his CSO requirements.

III RESULTS

This sub-sample of 192 probationers who were given a Debriefing Interview were fairly representative of the entire group of CSO programme participants in the pilot projects in Ontario (Polonoski, 1979), in terms of social histories and community service experiences. Due to the selection process, however, this group of offenders may also be more representative of the successfully completed CSO cases.

A. THE CSO PROBATIONERS DEBRIEFED

This section describes the 192 debriefed offenders who completed their CSOs in the pilot project areas. They are discussed in terms of their demographic backgrounds, work or school involvement and criminal histories. In addition, their perceptions of their treatment by the Judiciary are explored.

OVERVIEW

The majority of the probationers interviewed were male, approximately 22 years old and single. They were stable in terms of education and employment status, since over a third were involved in an educational programme at the time of their sentence and a fourth were working.

They were, on the whole, sentenced for a single offence only. Their offences were usually property-related, and in many cases, Theft Under \$200, Break and Enter or Theft Over \$200. The Courts sentenced the probationers to a mean of 13.7 months of probation and CSO assignments ranging from ten to 400 hours, with a mean of 65.8 hours.

During the Debriefing Interviews, the probationers expressed having been treated fairly by the Courts. One third said they assuredly would have gone to jail if they had not agreed to the Community Service Order, and almost seventy percent described how the CSO would help to keep them out of further trouble with the law.

1. Demographic Background

The majority of the 192 CSO probationers were male (140, 72.9% were male and 52, 27.1% were female) and were a mean age of 21.8 years old at the time of their sentence (see Table 2). As many as eight out of ten probationers were single, as might be anticipated for such a youthful sample (see Table 3). Only nine of those interviewed (4.7%) were of Native origin.

TABLE 2

AGE DISTRIBUTION OF PROBATIONERS AT
CSO DISPOSITION

<u>AGE (years)</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
16-17	58	34.3
18-20	55	32.5
21-25	30	17.8
26-60	26	15.4
Unknown	23	-
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>192</u>	<u>100.0</u>

Mean age of CSO probationers debriefed = 21.8 years

TABLE 3

MARITAL STATUS OF CSO PROBATIONERS
DEBRIEFED

<u>MARITAL STATUS</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Single	135	79.9
Married, common-law	22	13.0
Separated, divorced, widow(er)ed	12	7.1
Not reported	23	-
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>192</u>	<u>100.0</u>

TABLE 4

HIGHEST SCHOOL GRADE ACHIEVED

GRADE	N	%
6 - 8	22	13.5
9 or 10	70	42.9
11 - 13	64	39.3
University (1-3 years)	7	4.3
Not reported	29	-
TOTAL	192	100.0

TABLE 5

EDUCATIONAL INVOLVEMENT AT CSO

DISPOSITION

INVOLVED IN EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMME	N	%
Yes	39	36.8
No	67	63.2
Not reported	86	-
TOTAL	192	100.0

TABLE 6

EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT CSO DISPOSITION

EMPLOYMENT STATUS	N	%
Employed	50	41.0
Unemployed	67	54.9
Homemaker	5	4.1
Not reported	70	-
TOTAL	192	100.0

2. School and Work History

A relatively educated and stable group of probationers had been given the Debriefing Interview at the completion of their Orders. The highest school grade achieved by probationers was quite advanced, with a substantial proportion still involved in an educational programme at the time of their sentence. Eight in ten probationers had already achieved between one and five years of high school and almost five percent, some university (Table 4). Those interviewed had achieved a slightly higher educational level than the general CSO population in the pilot projects in Ontario (Polonoski, 1979). Over a third of those debriefed were involved in an educational pursuit at the time of their sentence, while four in ten were employed at a job (Table 5 and 6 respectively).

3. Criminal History

Over half of the offenders interviewed did not have a Pre-Sentence Report (P.S.R.) prepared on them by Probation & Parole Services prior to their sentence: 71 (40.3%) had a PSR on file and 105 (59.7%) did not (16 were not reported).

a. Prior Convictions

Information from Probation Services on the probationers' prior criminal histories was available for only 69 in this sub-sample (35.9%). Of these, less than a third (22, 31.9%) reportedly had a prior conviction and five offenders (2.9%) were already on probation when sentenced to their CSO (17 were not reported).

b. The Conviction Leading to the CSO Disposition

The majority of the 192 probationers were placed on probation with the CSO condition for a single offence (147, 83.5%). Nearly a fifth had been sentenced, however, for multiple offences of between two and seventeen charges (29, 16.5%; 16 were not reported).

The offences for which they had been issued CSOs were varied. Appendix A lists the specific offences for which those interviewed had been issued a CSO. The offences most often cited were Theft Under \$200 (67, 34.9%), Break and Enter (16, 8.3%) and Theft Over \$200 (15, 7.8%).

The probation terms handed down by the Courts ranged from one to 36 months (Table 7), with a mean term of 13.7 months. The terms of probation given to this sub-sample were slightly shorter than those issued to either the general CSO population in pilot projects or to regular adult probationers across Ontario (Polonoski, 1979).

The number of community service hours assigned by the Judiciary are indicated in Table 8. As shown, the mean number of hours assigned to this group was 65.8 hours, which is considerably greater than the 52.7 hours determined earlier for the general population in pilot project areas (Polonoski, 1979). It would appear that there were more probationers who completed Orders with a greater number of hours included in this second phase of the research.

The Judiciary were asked by programme developers to designate specifications related to the performance of the hours on the Orders, to facilitate the breaching procedures. As a result, Orders often have a specific commencement and/or completion date for working the hours, or a rate at which the hours must be performed. Nearly half of this group (76, 42.9%) had such conditions specified on their Orders (15 were not reported). In five cases there was a re-negotiation of these specifications during the performance of the CSO.

4. Probationers' Perceptions of Judicial Treatment

Probationers were probed during the interview regarding their perceptions on how they were treated by the Court. They were first asked whether they thought the Judge gave them a "fair deal" by ordering them to do community service work. The majority (164, 85.4%) felt they had been treated fairly (26, 13.5% felt they had not and 2, 1.0% were unsure). Their reasons for feeling that they had been treated fairly were offered by 144 offenders:

- 60 (41.7%) said the alternative to the CSO could have been a jail sentence and that the CSO was better than jail;
- 42 (29.2%) considered the CSO to be a better disposition than a fine. Some said the CSO was an easy disposition or that their general situation could have been worse;
- 42 (29.2%) felt the CSO was a "just" disposition, since in many cases, their offences were property-related (e.g. property damage). One offender requested the CSO.

TABLE 7

PROBATION TERMS OF CSO PROBATIONERS

DEBRIEFED

TERM OF PROBATION (months)	N	%
1 - 6	44	23.8
7 - 12	87	47.0
15 - 24	44	23.8
36	10	5.4
Not reported	7	-
TOTAL	192	100.0

Mean term of probation issued to CSO probationers = 13.7 months

TABLE 8

HOURS ASSIGNED TO CSO PROBATIONERS

NUMBER OF HOURS ASSIGNED (Hours)	N	%	Cumul. %
10 - 20	32	18.2	18.2
21 - 40	40	22.7	40.9
41 - 60	32	18.2	59.1
61 - 80	19	10.8	69.9
81 - 100	39	22.2	92.0
101 - 150	5	2.8	94.9
151 - 200	6	3.4	98.3
201 - 400	3	1.7	100.0
Not reported	16	-	
TOTAL	192	100.0	

Mean number of hours assigned = 65.8 hours.

Median = approximately 50 hours.

The 26 probationers who felt they had not been given a "fair deal" explained why they felt that way. Sixteen had been given a heavier sentence than they had anticipated or felt they were given too many CSO hours to perform. Seven protested their innocence, explaining they should not have been convicted at all or that the trial was unjust. Three would have preferred a fine or jail sentence or saw the CSO programme as ineffective and inconvenient.

Probationers were also asked if they thought they would have gone to jail if they had not agreed to do community service work. Their responses were fairly equally divided: a third said they would have gone to jail, a third said they would not and a third just did not know (70 or 36.4%, 61 or 31.8%, 60 or 31.3%, respectively). One probationer in this group did, in fact, go to jail prior to performing his community service hours.

Probationers were then asked if having worked on a CSO would help to keep them out of trouble with the law. Of the 191 who responded, 130 (68.1%) said it would, 35 (18.3%) said it would not and 26 (13.6%) did not know.

Half of the 117 probationers who explained how the CSO would help keep them out of trouble (62, 53.0%) felt they had learned a lesson. Several said they never wanted a CSO again or that they would get a jail term the next time they got into trouble. A few said that the programme was an inconvenience, since it took up much of their time; they had problems in reporting for probation or in fitting in their hours.

Almost a fifth (21, 17.9%) felt that working on their CSO had improved their self-esteem, their general outlook on life or their overall attitude. Some learned that what they did affected others and one probationer felt that the CSO experience might help him get a job.

A similar proportion of probationers (21, 17.9%) reported that their avoidance of further trouble would not be a function of the CSO experience. In fact, most of these said they had never been in trouble before and they would never be again, anyway. Two offenders expressed having learned more from the court experience itself than from the CSO.

A small group of probationers (12, 10.3%) said they would not be in further difficulty because of the changes the CSO made in their sparetime activities. They were making better use of their leisure time, spending less time drinking or not associating with their old peer group.

Of those who said the CSO experience was not going to help keep them out of trouble with the law, 30 gave two major reasons. Half said that their lives had not been changed or that only the offender, himself, or a jail term could keep them out of trouble. Fourteen others said that they would stay out of trouble for reasons unrelated to the CSO or that they simply would not be in trouble in any event. One probationer felt he had not committed a crime in the first place.

B. THE COMMUNITY SERVICE PLACEMENTS

This section describes the community placements at which CSO probationers provided their services. Probationers' perceptions of these placements and the treatment they received by staff and volunteers while there are also documented.

OVERVIEW

The CSO participants worked their assigned hours predominantly at one community placement only. The kinds of tasks they performed while there were varied, although half of those in this sample did simple, manual labour. Usually, their placements were such that they worked alongside and were supervised by regular, agency employees.

Probationers' sentiments about their placements were generally positive. The majority were able to name at least one placement which they enjoyed. Their reasons for liking a placement were comprised of positive comments about the people encountered, the kind of chores performed, the overall working conditions and the acquisition of new knowledge. Many were able to apply their skills and knowledge to their volunteer work and most considered their community service efforts as being helpful to the community at large.

While offenders reported that a wide variety of people at their placements were aware of their probation status, over 90% said that they had not been treated either differently or unfairly at the agencies. Moreover, a third of this sample intended to continue to provide their services as volunteers.

1. Description of the Placements

Data were available on the community service experiences of those interviewed in 177 cases (92.2%) .

Over one-quarter of the probationers interviewed for their perceptions of the CSO experience had worked at more than one placement situation. Precisely 49 (27.7%) worked at between two and five different placements, while 128 (72.3%) remained with one single placement throughout their work experience (15 were not reported).

The tasks performed by this group were varied, as shown in Table 9. However, the type of work performed by them most often was that of simple manual labour (the tasks performed were not reported for 17 cases). Approximately one-third of those interviewed, however, had worked directly with other persons, such as the blind, handicapped or elderly, in a helping capacity. Moreover, as many as eight in ten probationers (135, 78.0%) had been, at some time during their community service experience, in contact with those who were the recipients of their services (19 were not reported).

Probationers largely worked alongside regular, paid, agency staff while on placement:

- 149/176, 84.7% worked with regular, agency employees;
- 52/176, 29.5% worked alongside other volunteers who were also offenders;
- 66/176, 37.5% worked with other volunteers who were non-offenders;
- only 32/175, 18.3% worked entirely alone.

Similarly, the largest proportion of offenders (143/174, 82.2%) had been supervised by regular, agency employees. In addition, probationers were supervised by Probation Services, other agency volunteers and CSO Co-ordinators (9/174, 5.2%; 24/173, 13.9%; 29/174, 16.7%, respectively).

2. Probationers' Perceptions of their CSO Placements

A major responsibility of CSO Co-ordinators is the careful matching of skills and interests of probationers with the job placements available in the community. This matching (or mis-matching) can have profound effect on the offender's ultimate completion of his Order.

TABLE 9

TASKS PERFORMED BY CSO PROBATIONERS

DEBRIEFED

TASKS	N	% of 175
• Delivery, chauffeur, elevator operator, protective service	10	5.7
• Repairs, maintenance, construction, painting, manual labour	90	51.4
• Help with handicapped, blind, sick, mentally retarded, senior citizens, teens, children	60	34.3
• Office/clerical work, festival/ programme organization, map drawing, report writing, research, stage direction, translation, book repair	30	17.1
• Help with animals or game	13	7.4
• Cooking or kitchen duties	8	4.6
• Treeplanting, gardening, in greenhouse, hauling/piling lumber, clearing bush, landscaping	11	6.3
• Work at recycling plant, sorting goods for needy	11	6.3

Offenders were asked which community service jobs or placements they liked and disliked working at, and why they felt the way they did. Of all the probationers interviewed, 162 (84.4%) mentioned at least one placement they liked and 46 (24.0%) mentioned at least one placement they disliked.

When offenders were asked why they liked any of their placement(s), 134 gave an explanation. Their reasons were categorized into five broad areas.

- 1) Probationers expressed positive feelings about the people at their placement(s) (N = 64, 47.8%).

Probationers reported that they liked their co-workers and/or their supervisors at their placements, or enjoyed being directly involved in a helping capacity with other people.

- 2) Probationers had positive feelings about the kind of community service work they had done (N = 51, 38.1%).

They expressed positive feelings about their work because they were able to use some old skills, and because the work was enjoyable or easy to do. Many said they had done that kind of work before their CSO and had liked it.

- 3) Probationers expressed positive feelings about the physical working conditions at the placements (N = 33, 24.6%).

Offenders expressed positive feelings about the physical surroundings, working conditions or the location of their placement(s).

- 4) Probationers gained some personal satisfaction or knowledge from the CSO experience (N = 28, 20.9%).

Many probationers enjoyed an increased sense of responsibility or independence; some felt useful or good about their work. Others developed a new interest as a result of their community service work and some felt they had learned something new. The work was said to be interesting, as well as useful for getting one probationer "out of the house".

- 5) Other reasons (N = 3, 2.2%).

One probationer reported liking his placement because his family was involved in and enjoyed it as well, one because the work was a better alternative than jail and one because the placement was simply more enjoyable than he had expected.

When asked why they disliked any of their placements, 41 probationers gave explanations which fell into four major categories.

- 1) Probationers expressed negative feelings about the kind of community service work they had done (N = 27, 65.9%).

Probationers reported negative feelings about their jobs because they found their work boring or too difficult. While some did not like that particular kind of work they had done, others did not like having to work at all. A few offenders reported not getting the kind of job they had originally been promised.

- 2) Probationers expressed negative feelings about the physical working conditions at the placement(s) (N = 7, 7.1%)

A few probationers reported having to work under what they felt were unpleasant environmental conditions. Some did not like the hours they had to work.

- 3) Probationers expressed negative feelings about the people at their placement(s) (N = 6, 14.6%).

A small number expressed having problems with their co-workers and/or their supervisors at their placement(s). One offender reported having difficulty understanding "foreigners" at his placement.

- 4) The placement(s) appeared to have organizational problems (N = 6, 14.6%).

Probationers felt that their efforts were not appreciated by the placement or that the placement was generally poorly organized.

Co-ordinators asked probationers if the community service work they actually did was the type they had asked for (see Table 10). Almost two-thirds of the respondents (121, 63.7%) reported that they had done their preferred type of work.

TABLE 10

WORK DONE BY PROBATIONER WAS WORK CHOSEN

<u>PROBATIONER'S RESPONSE</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Yes	121	63.7
No	9	4.7
Yes & no	23	12.1
Did not care/did not choose	37	19.5
No response	2	-
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>192</u>	<u>100.0</u>

A substantial proportion said they simply did not care what kind of work they did or that they did not choose a type of job.

It was of particular interest to determine if the offenders had been able to use any of their skills or knowledge in the performance of their tasks. The majority of those interviewed (135, 70.3%) reported that they had used their skills (48, 25.0% reported that they had not and 9, 4.7% said they had no skills).

Probationers were also asked if they had learned anything new or useful as a result of their community service experience. Their responses were fairly evenly split: 106, 55.2% responded positively and 86, 44.8%, negatively. Of those who had learned something new or useful, 97 explained what they had acquired:

- 26, 26.8% learned a new mechanical or other special skill;
- 17, 17.5% acquired a new communication skill or greater personal insight;
- 16, 16.5% acquired new interests in pursuing their education, in volunteer work or in some aspect of the work they had done. Some gained new work attitudes;

- 16, 16.5% learned new skills in the general care of people and animals;
- 12, 12.4% learned something new about a particular community agency, or about society as a whole;
- 10, 10.3% had improved upon an old skill.

If the offender views his community service work as being meaningful or useful, then the likelihood of his completing the assigned job is increased, as is the chance for his improving his self-esteem. Probationers were asked whether they felt their community service work was helpful to the community. The majority (174, 90.6%) did consider it to be helpful and only 15 (7.8%) did not (3, 1.6% said that some work was helpful and some was not). Of those who thought the work was helpful, 166 probationers explained their feelings. Their reasons fell into four broad categories.

- 1) *The placement or agency filled a specific need in the community (N = 95, 57.2%).*
- 2) *The probationer, himself, felt his efforts filled a specific need in the community (N = 52, 31.3%).*

Probationers reported that extra help was needed at their placements and that the work would very likely not have been done without them. They felt appreciated by their respective agencies, and the community as a whole. They said, also, that the agency was able to enjoy a financial saving by using volunteer workers.

- 3) *People with special needs were helped (N = 35, 21.1%).*

Probationers felt their jobs were helpful because they worked with people with special needs, such as the blind, sick, handicapped and with children.

- 4) *Other reasons (N = 3, 1.8%).*

One probationer felt his work was helpful to the community because it helped to keep him out of further trouble. The others felt it saved the taxpayers' money by keeping people out of jail.

Only eleven probationers explained why they felt their work was not helpful to the community. Their reasons were largely related to organizational problems encountered at their placements. They felt the facility was run poorly, that their free labour was being taken advantage of or that they just were not needed. Some probationers felt that they were taking work away from paying positions, or that it was helpful to the specific agency but not to the community at large.

Few of the probationers had ever done any volunteer or community service work before their CSO experience. Less than a quarter had been volunteers before, while the majority had not (42, 21.9% and 150, 78.1%, respectively). When co-ordinators asked probationers if they expected to continue to do volunteer work in the community although their CSO was completed, there was a mixed reaction among respondents. One-third (65, 34.0%) said they expected to continue their volunteer work, one-third (68, 35.6%) said they did not and a third (58, 30.4%) said they may (there was no response from one offender).

In order to tap how satisfied offenders actually were with their placements, they were asked if they would be willing to take a paid job at the agency, if it were possible. The assumption was that if the probationer was willing to work at an agency, then the community service experience must have been fairly positive. Of the 179 probationers who gave a definite response, two-thirds (121, 67.6%) said they would be willing to work at an agency and 21.8% (39) said they would not (19, 10.6% did not know).

3. Probationers' Perceptions of their Treatment at Placements

A series of questions were asked of probationers regarding their feelings about their treatment at community service placements by the people encountered there. First, however, probationers were asked who at the placements knew he or she was on probation. Their responses were as follows:

- 3 (1.6%) said no one knew;
- 167 (87.9%) said the agency supervisor knew;
- 104 (54.4%) said co-workers at the agency knew;
- 42 (22.0%) said other volunteers at the placement knew;
- 21 (11.0%) said the beneficiaries of their services knew.

A wide variety of people at the agencies therefore reportedly knew about the offender's probation. Probationers did not feel, however, that they were treated either differently from the other community agency staff or volunteers or unfairly by them. Only 11 (5.9% of the 187 who responded) felt they had been treated differently (176, 94.1% responded that they had not). In explanation as to how they had been treated differently, seven of the 10 probationers who gave an answer said they had been given harder work or more work, had been treated with less respect or had been "used". One probationer simply felt new on the job, but two probationers reported that they were treated with more respect or better than the other workers.

Of the 189 probationers who responded as to whether they felt they had been treated unfairly at any of the community agencies, only 10 (5.3%) responded affirmatively. Their reasons were that they had been made to work too hard, given the "dirty" work or that they had had a poor relationship with a supervisor.

One of the potential problems of the CSO programme is in ensuring that probationers get to their placements. Almost fourteen percent (26, 13.6%) of the 191 probationers who responded, reported having had problems in getting to or from their assigned placements.

C. THE IMPACT OF THE COMMUNITY SERVICE EXPERIENCE

This section focuses on the process of completing the CSO assignments and the impact this process had on the probationers' lifestyle.

OVERVIEW

This small group of subjects had performed a total of 11,778 hours of free, community service. While the majority worked precisely the number of hours assigned to them, 21% worked more than were required. Completion of the assignment was achieved by one quarter within the first month of beginning it, and by almost half, within two months. In all, 97% successfully completed their Orders. In most cases, the probationers interviewed provided satisfactory service at all of their community placements and according to co-ordinators, one-fifth had maintained contact with a placement either as an employee or a volunteer, after the completion of their Orders. Only 2.9% of this sample had been reconvicted during the performance of their CSOs.

The areas in their lives most commonly cited by offenders as having been affected by the performance of their community service work were their work lives, leisure interests, social activities and general attitudes. Moreover, three-quarters of this sample reported that their family and/or friends had shown an interest in their community service, by encouraging and supporting them and, in some cases, engaging in their activities as well.

1. The Performance of the Community Service Assignment

Interviewed probationers had worked a total of 11,778 hours, ranging from 10 to 400 hours (15 cases were not reported). By far, the majority worked precisely the number of hours assigned to them by the Judiciary:

- 134 (76.1%) worked the exact number of hours assigned to them;
- 37 (21.0%) worked more hours than assigned;
- 5 (2.8%) worked fewer hours than assigned;
- 16 were not reported.

The length of time taken by probationers to perform their required number of hours ranged from one month to a year, as indicated in Table 11. One quarter of this group completed their assignments within a month of beginning them and nearly half had their assignments completed within two months. The mean length of time taken was 3.5 months. This sub-sample of CSO probationers therefore had worked a greater average number of hours than the general CSO pilot population, but had completed their Orders in roughly the same length of time (Polonoski, 1979).

Probationers reportedly worked mostly during weekdays and during the daytime (Table 12). This is similar to the work schedule reported for the general CSO population (Polonoski, 1979). This group was also quite diligent in working at their assignments: 90.1% (155) kept their work appointments regularly, while only 9.9% (17) did not (20 were not reported). Twenty-two probationers (12.4%) had had their probation period terminated early for satisfactorily completing their assignments, shortly after this completion (information was unavailable in 15 cases).

TABLE 11

TIME TAKEN TO PERFORM COMMUNITY SERVICE

ASSIGNMENT

<u>TIME TAKEN</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>CUMUL. %</u>
One month	44	26.7	26.7
Two months	32	19.4	46.1
Three months	23	13.9	60.0
Four to six months	45	27.3	87.8
Seven to nine months	14	8.5	95.8
10 to 12 months	7	4.2	100.0
Not reported	27	-	
TOTAL	192	100.0	

Mean length of time taken to perform community service =

3.5 months

TABLE 12

WHEN PROBATIONER USUALLY WORKED ON CSO

WHEN USUALLY WORKED N % of 174

Part of Week:

Weekdays	106	60.9
Weekends	30	17.2
Both	38	21.8
Not reported	18	-

Part of Day:

Daytime	126	72.4
Evenings	22	12.6
Both	26	14.9
Not reported	18	-

The agencies providing placements for the CSO programme reported a very high level of satisfaction with the efforts of the probationers. All but one of the probationers, in this sub-sample had provided satisfaction to some of the agencies at which they had worked. Well over ninety percent (166, 97.1%) had reportedly provided satisfactory services to all of their placements and only two percent (4) had provided satisfactory service at some and dissatisfactory service at others (agency satisfaction was not reported in 21 cases). One-fifth of those interviewed had reportedly maintained contact with a community placement either as an employee or a volunteer (36, 21.4%; Table 13), after the completion of their Orders.

TABLE 13

CONTINUATION OF CONTACT WITH AGENCIES
BY PROBATIONERS AFTER CSO COMPLETION

<u>CONTINUED AGENCY</u> <u>ASSOCIATION</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Yes, is a volunteer	31	18.5
Yes, is employed	5	3.0
No	132	78.6
Not reported	24	-
TOTAL	192	100.0

Reconvictions occurred infrequently during the probationers' community service experiences. Out of the 192 probationers who were interviewed, only 5 or 2.9% had been reconvicted during the performance of their CSO hours (17 cases were not reported). These five offenders had been convicted of one offence each: two had committed a property-related offence (Break and Enter, and Theft Over \$200), one, a liquor offence, one, a traffic offence and one, an offence against public order and peace (Breach of Probation, specifically a breach of the CSO condition).

Two probationers were fined as a result of their convictions, one received probation for an unreported length of time, one was incarcerated for between ten and fifteen days and one probationer had an unreported disposition.

2. Impact of Community Service on Probationers' Lifestyle

Probationers were asked during the interview, a number of questions regarding the impact of working community service hours on their lifestyle. Of course, the interest shown by the probationer's family and friends in his or her community service work could have an impact on performance. All the offenders were, therefore, asked whether their families or friends had shown an interest in their community service work. Of the 189 who responded, almost three-quarters reported that their family and/or friends had shown some interest:

- 77, 40.7% said their families had shown an interest;
- 22, 11.6% said their friends had shown an interest;
- 38, 20.1% said both their families and friends had shown an interest.

The way in which their interest was shown were solicited and 125 probationers responded:

- 84, 67.2% said they had shown an interest in his progress and activities and gave encouragement and support;
- 25, 20.0% said they became actively involved in the probationer's experience by engaging in his activities at the placement and by helping with his transportation needs;
- 16, 12.8% said their family and/or friends thought the programme was a good idea because it kept the probationer busy, it got him involved in community volunteer work or because it was a good punishment.

One-quarter (52, 27.5%) reported that neither their family nor friends had shown an interest in their community service work. One-third of these (19, 35.8%), however, reported that their family and friends had not even known about their CSO (31 or 58.5% said they did know and 3 or 5.7% said some knew and some did not).

Co-ordinators asked the probationers whether doing community service work had made any difference to their lives, especially in the areas of their employment, education, leisure interests, social activities and family life.

a. Employment

Just over a tenth (26, 13.5%) of those interviewed indicated that their CSO experience had had some impact on their work life:

- 7 had gained a better attitude towards work or some good work experience;
- 5 had had an old interest re-awakened, had developed an interest in a new field or had decided they were not interested in a particular field;
- 14 had been able to get a job, to renew their interest in looking for work or to develop a lead to a job.

b. Education

Only four probationers (2.1%) indicated that their CSO had had some impact on their schooling. They reported having been able to obtain some training in a specific area through the CSO, to work in a field directly related to their studies or to gain some incentive for doing better at school.

c. Leisure Interests

Thirty-six offenders (18.8%) had had their normal leisure activities affected by the CSO experience. While 20 felt they were making better use of their spare time, 10 noted that their normal leisure activities had been curtailed as a result of the CSO commitment. The remainder developed new interests, such as volunteer work, or strengthened an old recreational activity.

d. Social Activities

Almost one-quarter of the probationers (44, 22.9%) felt their normal social life had been affected by the CSO experience. Thirty-six said they had developed better or new attitudes to other people, or the community as a whole, and eight simply said they had made new friends.

e. Family Life

Five offenders felt the CSO had had an impact on their family life, three of whom perceived it as a positive impact. These three felt more appreciated by their families, felt closer to them, or enjoyed their families' participation in their community service work. Two probationers felt unhappy at having to be away from their families while fulfilling their CSO obligation.

f. Other Areas

Various other ways in which probationers had been affected by the CSO experience were reported. Forty-four probationers (22.9%) said they had gained some insights into other areas of their lives or into the broader community and fourteen said they now wanted to stay out of further trouble with the law. Fifteen reported having gained some deeper understanding of or personal commitment to a community agency. A further fifteen said their self-esteem had been enhanced, they had felt good about their service work, they had learned something new or that they had become more outgoing.

D. PROBATIONERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE CSO AS A SENTENCING OPTION

Section D describes the benefits and drawbacks of the CSO programme and the ways in which it can be improved, as perceived by this sample of participants.

OVERVIEW

On the whole, probationers found the CSO experience to be a positive and profitable one. Precisely 90% mentioned at least one perceived benefit of the CSO programme, while less than half mentioned a drawback. Probationers most often cited having gained some measure of personal satisfaction from their community service as a benefit. The most serious problem, as perceived by offenders, however, was that the CSO obligation consumed time they normally spent at other activities. Half of those who gave recommendations for improving the CSO Programme suggested that it be expanded.

The wide variety of perceived benefits of the CSO disposition as given by 173 probationers were categorized into six major areas.

1. *Probationers were able to experience some personal gratification from working on the CSO (N = 73, 42.2%).*

Probationers reported that working on the CSO was an interesting experience wherein they had learned new things or had acquired new values. They had applied their knowledge and abilities and had even improved upon them. They had enjoyed a sense of responsibility and appreciation by others and, ultimately, had improved their self-esteem.

2. *The CSO was a good alternative sentence (N = 58, 33.5%).*

The CSO disposition kept the probationers out of jail, so they could continue a normal life. It was considered a better disposition than a fine or long period of probation. Working on the CSO had taught them a lesson and had given them an opportunity to pay back their debts to society in a positive manner. This alternative had also cost less to the taxpayer than sending an offender to jail.

3. *Probationers were able to become involved with other people (N = 49, 28.3%).*

Probationers were able to make new friends, meet new people or work with others in a helping capacity. Also, the probationers' family and friends were able to benefit from the CSO experience.

4. *Working on the CSO helped probationers to stay out of trouble with the law (N = 33, 19.1%).*

Probationers had made better use of their spare time and were able to improve their social lives. Working on the CSO kept them busy and offenders had been able to work in their free time. The CSO experience had also provided an incentive to stay out of trouble with the law.

5. *Probationers developed a greater awareness of their communities or society as a whole (N = 39, 22.5%).*

The probationers had become more aware of and involved in their communities and had developed new respect for society and the legal system. The service work done by them had been useful and had provided a real service to the community.

6. *The CSO experience had had a positive effect on probationers' work/school commitments (N = 10, 5.8%).*

A few probationers had been able to find jobs or acquire some work experience. Working on a CSO had helped to renew their interest in working or continuing with their education.

Probationers were asked what they thought the drawbacks of working on a CSO were. Eighty-four probationers gave at least one drawback and all those given were categorized into four areas.

1. *Probationers faced problems with the time element of the CSO (N = 60, 71.4%)*

Working on the CSO had reportedly used up the probationer's spare time - time which might have been spent with his or her family, in looking for work or attending work or school. Several had felt the programme was an overall waste of time.

2. *Probationers faced organizational problems with the CSO programme (N = 20, 23.8%).*

Some of the probationers interviewed had felt that the CSO programme was not operating at optimal efficiency. In some cases, the specific agencies were described as not operating efficiently; sufficient work had not been available at placements, so offenders just "filled in time". Probationers noted having had transportation costs, bemoaning the fact that they had not been paid for their efforts.

3. *Probationers described theoretical problems with the CSO programme (N = 10, 11.9%).*

A few probationers had felt the CSO programme was not right for everyone, that some people might abuse the programme or that some offenders should actually go to jail. Probationers said they had taken a chance at being assigned an unpleasant task; some had felt pressured by their work assignments or had disliked always having the CSO responsibility hanging above them. A few offenders said they had experienced feelings of isolation or humiliation during the performance of their CSO hours.

Any recommendations or suggestions probationers might have for improving the CSO programme were solicited. The 51 respondents gave four major recommendations.

1. *Expand the CSO programme (N = 26, 51.0%).*

Half of the respondents made recommendations related to the expansion of the CSO Programme, with the development of more placements in more areas. They had felt the programme deserved greater exposure by the media and that people should be encouraged to become volunteers. One probationer, however, suggested that the programme be reduced.

2. *Improve the procedures for scheduling community service hours and secure transportation for offenders (N = 12, 23.5%).*

Offenders requested greater freedom in determining their work schedule and recommended that transportation be secured for them.

3. *Improve the general organization of the CSO programme (N = 11, 21.6%).*

A few probationers suggested that the programme be for first offenders only; the CSO work should be more related to individual offences; the CSO should be more meaningful for both the individual and for the community. They recommended that placement agencies be better adapted for volunteer work and that they be in greater contact with CSO programme organizers.

4. *Improve the kinds of placements assigned to probationers (N = 9, 17.6%).*

Offenders suggested that they be permitted to choose their placements and that programme organizers make greater use of group placement situations. They recommended that more supervision and training of probationers be provided, that the work be more interesting or that the probationers be treated by agencies as regular workers.

IV DISCUSSION

A. EXPERIENCES AND PERCEPTIONS OF PROBATIONERS IN RELATION TO THE OBJECTIVES OF THE ONTARIO CSO PROGRAMME

The objectives of the Community Service Order programme were developed by the Provincial Co-ordinator for Community Service Order Programme Development, in the fall of 1977. These objectives are discussed in turn here, in relation to the experiences and perceptions of a sub-sample of those probationers who participated in the programme.

The data indicated that this sub-sample of probationers were relatively stable and, on the whole, found the CSO experience, in some way, rewarding. In terms of the objectives of the programme, it would appear that the CSO programme is successfully providing both an alternative sentencing disposition and a positive experience to offenders. However, the reader is cautioned that these findings are tentative, based on the experiences and responses of 192 probationers who completed their Orders and were subsequently interviewed.

1. OBJECTIVE I: To Offer a Community-Based Alternative Sentence to Incarceration

It is unclear by these limited data whether the CSO disposition is actually an alternative sentence to incarceration. It does appear that, on the basis of the sentencing procedures, it is a community-based alternative disposition, with considerable emphasis on the probationers' involvement in the community. According to the probationers themselves, however, for many, the threat of a period of incarceration at the time of their sentence was a very real one.

By and large, the sample of offenders interviewed were not serious offenders. Eighty percent had been sentenced to a CSO for a single offence. Offences were also relatively non-serious in nature, with those most often cited being Theft Under \$200, Theft Over \$200 and Break and Enter.

While the mean number of hours assigned to this sample was greater than that determined earlier for the total CSO population, this situation may have partially been a function of the sampling procedures. In any event, there seems to have been a shift in emphasis to greater sentences of community service, since half of those interviewed were sentenced to between 41 and 100 hours of community work (90, 51.1%).

When asked whether they thought they would have gone to jail if they had not agreed to work on a CSO, a third of those interviewed responded in the affirmative and a third, in the negative. (Only one probationer had been sentenced to a jail term prior to working his community service hours, therefore his CSO disposition was clearly not an alternative to incarceration).

The probationers were also questioned for their perceptions of the CSO as a sentencing option, in terms of the benefits and drawbacks they saw in the programme. On the whole, the benefits accrued far out-numbered the drawbacks. One of the major positive aspects of the CSO programme given by probationers was that it kept them out of a correctional facility, so that they might continue to enjoy a normal lifestyle. The programme gave them the opportunity to repay society for their misdeeds, as well as be less costly to the taxpayer than incarceration of offenders.

According to a very limited number of probationers, the CSO programme might be an inappropriately applied community-based alternative to incarceration. One of the lesser drawbacks of the programme, as expressed by a few participants, was a problem in the selection process. A few of those interviewed indicated a need for more stringent guidelines for selecting offenders for the CSO Programme. They suggested that there may be some offenders in the programme who, they felt, should actually have gone to jail.

2. OBJECTIVE II: To Facilitate the Participation of the Community in the Criminal Justice System

There appears to have been a high level of interaction between the community and the probationers in the CSO programme. Many probationers were exposed to a variety of community settings and people while on work placement. One-quarter of the participants in this phase of the study had worked at two or more agencies or settings. While performing their community service hours, eighty percent had had their activities supervised by regular, paid staff at the placements.

Once the participant was assigned to his/her placement, a wide variety of people encountered there were aware of the offender's criminal involvement. Only three offenders reported that no one at their placement(s) knew of their probation status. In most cases, the offenders said that their supervisor at the agency knew about their record and, in many cases, co-workers at the placement knew. Despite this broad awareness of the probationer's status, only five to six percent reported having been treated either differently or unfairly while on placement in a community agency.

3. OBJECTIVE III: To Allow the Offender to Participate in the Determination of an Appropriate Sanction

Motivation for successful completion of the community service hours is contingent upon many variables, including the proper matching of an offender's skills to placements and his acceptance of the disposition as being fair.

The majority of those interviewed felt they had been treated fairly by the Judiciary when sentenced to their CSOs. While many viewed the CSO disposition as easier or better than jail or a fine, there were about three in ten who considered it to be a "just" sentence. In some of these cases, probationers had committed a property-related offence, such as Theft or Property Damage, and were repaying what was felt to be a debt to society through their community service work.

While twenty percent either did not care what kind of work they were assigned to do or did not choose their task, almost two-thirds reported that they had actually been able to perform the type of job they had asked for. This might certainly influence the probationer's motivation for completion of their assigned hours. In fact, 97% of the probationers interviewed successfully completed their CSOs, with 21% working more community service hours than were required of them.

4. OBJECTIVE IV: To Encourage the Responsible Behaviour of the Offender

During the performance of their community service hours, offenders are often exposed to responsible members in community and more acceptable behaviour patterns. Probationers in this sub-sample were reportedly demonstrating such responsible behaviour in several ways.

Ninety percent of those interviewed had kept their work appointments regularly and ten percent had had their probation periods terminated early for successfully completing their assignments. Only five offenders had been convicted of an offence during the performance of their CSO hours.

Participants were asked, in the interview, if having done this community service work would help keep them out of further trouble with the law. Almost seventy percent responded that it would help them. The reasons given for feeling this way were varied, although almost half explained that they had learned a lesson and that they never wanted a CSO again, largely because it was

inconvenient. Almost twenty percent explained that the CSO experience had helped to improve their self-esteem, attitudes or general behaviour.

There were, however, thirty-five respondents who asserted that the CSO experience would not help to keep them out of further trouble with the law. Most of these explained that only their own willpower or a jail term would be able to accomplish this.

5. OBJECTIVE V: To Provide a Worthwhile Experience to the Offender

One of the prime goals of this research phase was to determine what kind of experience probationers actually had in this community programme. The overall indication seems to be that participants were exposed to a rewarding and positive experience.

Of all those interviewed, 84.4% named at least one placement which they enjoyed. They expressed having positive feelings about the people they encountered, the kind of work they had done and the physical working conditions. In addition, a respectable proportion felt they had gained some personal satisfaction or knowledge from the experience.

While half of the participants had worked at a manual labour type of job some time during their community service (51.4%), a third had helped the handicapped, sick, elderly or very young. Almost a fifth had performed clerical tasks ranging from map drawing to book repairing.

Specifically, all the probationers in this study were asked whether they had learned anything new or useful while in the CSO programme. The half of the sample who felt they had gained something, spoke of learning new mechanical, communication or interpersonal skills, and of developing new outside interests or social attitudes.

Several probationers had also reported that the CSO experience had had some positive effect on their lifestyles, particularly in their work lives, sparetime activities and social lives. Almost one-quarter expressed having gained some insight into their own behaviour or into the broader community.

Listed among the benefits of the CSO programme, as viewed by the participants, were several which described how the offenders were benefitted personally. They had gained some personal gratification from their volunteer

community service and had been able to come into contact with a non-offender group at their placements, where they made new friends and became helpers to a needy group of people. They had developed a greater awareness of their local communities and society, in the broader sense, and 5.8% reported that the experience had had a beneficial effect on their work or school commitments.

Despite the fact that their assigned hours had been completed, one-fifth of those interviewed had maintained contact with one of their placements as an employee or a volunteer. In fact, as mentioned, one-fifth had worked more hours as a volunteer than they had been required to by law. During the debriefing, participants were asked if they would be willing to take a job at any of their placements if they were able to, and the majority responded that they would be willing to do so.

6. OBJECTIVE VI: To Be a Programme of Tangible Benefit to the Community

The best single indicator of the benefit of the Community Service Order programme to the community is the number of unpaid hours of work given by the probationers. This small sub-sample of offenders had provided a total of 11,778 hours of free labour. The monetary value of this service, at an arbitrary wage of \$3.00 per hour, computes to \$25,334.00. The social value can be determined in terms of real work accomplished in the community, i.e. repairs were made, patients were visited, clothes were recycled and meals were delivered to the elderly.

It is important, however, that the offenders view their job assignments as meaningful or useful to the community. In fact, 91% of the offenders in this study did feel that their work had been helpful. Over half of these felt this way because the agency to which they had been assigned provided a beneficial function in the community. Almost a third said the work they did would not have been done without them or they felt the agency was appreciative of their efforts. Specifically, 21% said they had helped people with special needs.

7. OBJECTIVE VII: To Promote Greater Understanding of Offenders by the Community

The CSO experience appears to have been a positive one from both the standpoint of the offenders and the community at large. According to the local CSO Co-ordinators, nearly all of the offenders in this interviewed group had provided satisfactory service at all the placements at which they had worked. According to the probationers themselves, they had been treated neither unfairly nor differently from others while on placement in the community.

8. OBJECTIVE VIII: To Encourage Offenders to Spend Their Leisure Time in a Meaningful Way

The CSO disposition requires that the offender perform a specific number of hours of community service work. The offender is, therefore, obliged to allocate some of his spare time towards the attainment of this goal. In the interviews, probationers reported that their normal leisure activities had been altered by this obligation, both positively and negatively.

Approximately one-fifth of those interviewed had done volunteer work before their CSO experience. A similar proportion, as already seen, had reportedly given more hours of their time than was required of them by the Courts. During the debriefing, one-third indicated that they expected to continue to do volunteer work although their CSO assignments were completed. Moreover, a tenth said they would not be in further difficulty with the law, because they were now making better use of their leisure time, drinking less or avoiding an old peer group.

Probationers reported that besides having made better use of spare time, they developed new interests, for example, in volunteer work. Some, however, explained that their leisure time had been curtailed by the CSO obligation. In fact, almost three-quarters of those who mentioned a drawback to the programme, cited having had less time to spend with their family, in looking for work, attending school or working.

9. OBJECTIVE IX: To Bring the Offender in Contact with the Recipient of the Help

An analysis of the kinds of duties performed by probationers indicated that one-third of this interviewed group had been in direct service to the handicapped, blind, sick, mentally retarded, elderly, and with teens or children. At some time during their CSO experience, however, over three-quarters had been in contact, even in passing, with the recipients of their help.

Serving in a helping capacity seemed to be a positive feature of the programme according to respondents. One of the benefits of the programme mentioned by participants was its facilitating involvement with other people, including those with special needs. Many of those who expressed positive feelings about the people encountered at their placements did so because they were able to enjoy acting in a helping capacity to others. In fact,

many of those who viewed their community service work as helpful to the community felt this way because they had worked with a special group or person.

10. OBJECTIVE X: To Give the Offender the Opportunity to Work Alongside Non-Offenders

Participants in this study had been exposed to a non-criminal population in their communities. They mostly worked alongside regular, paid, agency personnel and/or with other volunteers who were non-offenders, while on placement. Furthermore, among those who mentioned benefits to the CSO programme, were those who appreciated being able to become involved with people in general. They claimed they had made new friends, had met new people and had helped others with special needs.

V REFERENCES

Polonoski, Marian. The Community Service Order Programme in Ontario. 1. A Description of the Initial Cases. Toronto, Ontario: Ministry of Correctional Services, June, 1979.

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A

OFFENCES FOR WHICH DEBRIEFED PROBATIONERS WERE ISSUED A CSO

PROBATIONERS CONVICTED OF AT LEAST ONE:	N	% of 192
Offence Against Person		
• assault (common, bodily)	5	2.6
• assault police	2	1.0
• intimidation	1	0.5
Offence Against Property		
• theft under \$200	67	34.9*
• theft over \$200 (incl. auto theft)	15	7.8*
• attempt theft	3	1.6
• break and enter	16	8.3*
• break, enter and theft	5	2.6
• forgery, fraud, false pretences, uttering	11	5.7
• mischief causing damage, wilful damage	12	6.3
• possess stolen property over \$200	6	3.1
• possess stolen property under \$200	10	5.2
• take vehicle without consent	5	2.6
Offence Against Public Morals & Decency		
• indecent acts	1	0.5
• perjury, false statement	1	0.5
Offence Against Public Order & Peace		
• obstruct police	3	1.6
• fail to appear	2	1.0
• breach of probation	1	0.5
• cause disturbance	3	1.6
• weapons and firearms	3	1.6
Liquor Offence		
• impaired driving, over 80	6	3.1
Drug Offence		
• simple possession (marijuana, restricted drug, narcotic)	11	5.7
• trafficking	2	1.0
Traffic Offence		
• drive while license suspended	4	2.1
• dangerous driving	9	4.7
• fail to remain	1	0.5
Other Federal Statutes	1	0.5
Offence Unknown	2	1.0

* Offences most commonly reported.

END