

University of Windsor

Scholarship at UWindor

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Theses, Dissertations, and Major Papers

1999

Controlling youth crime: A qualitative analysis of informal and formal social controls.

Jill Elizabeth. Johns
University of Windsor

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd>

Recommended Citation

Johns, Jill Elizabeth., "Controlling youth crime: A qualitative analysis of informal and formal social controls." (1999). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 1570.
<https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd/1570>

This online database contains the full-text of PhD dissertations and Masters' theses of University of Windsor students from 1954 forward. These documents are made available for personal study and research purposes only, in accordance with the Canadian Copyright Act and the Creative Commons license—CC BY-NC-ND (Attribution, Non-Commercial, No Derivative Works). Under this license, works must always be attributed to the copyright holder (original author), cannot be used for any commercial purposes, and may not be altered. Any other use would require the permission of the copyright holder. Students may inquire about withdrawing their dissertation and/or thesis from this database. For additional inquiries, please contact the repository administrator via email (scholarship@uwindsor.ca) or by telephone at 519-253-3000ext. 3208.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

Bell & Howell Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

UMI[®]

NOTE TO USERS

Page(s) not included in the original manuscript are unavailable from the author or university. The manuscript was microfilmed as received.

24

This reproduction is the best copy available

UMI

**CONTROLLING YOUTH CRIME:
A QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS OF INFORMAL
AND FORMAL SOCIAL CONTROLS**

by

Jill Johns

M.A. Thesis

Submitted to the College of Graduate Studies and Research
through the Department of Sociology and Anthropology
in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for
the Degree of Master of Arts at the University of Windsor.

Windsor, Ontario, Canada

1999

© 1999 Jill Johns



National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file *Votre référence*

Our file *Notre référence*

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-52581-3

Canada

Abstract

This study examined the effectiveness of the threat of punishment in deterring young offenders from criminal activity, exploring both formal and informal methods of social control. Twenty young offenders, incarcerated in an open-custody facility, were interviewed about their informal sources of social control, including their history of education, previous employment, peer groups, family relations, and perceptions of morality. More formally instituted methods of social control were also evaluated, including previous police contact, experience within the court system, custodial experience, certainty of punishment, knowledge and perceptions of a strict discipline program, probability of deterrence, and perceived fairness of punishment.

To summarize informal social control, these participants appear to have developed a bond to the educational system while attending the in-house school. Most participants also reported a positive attachment to previous employment. However, familial relations do not appear to serve as a source of control, in spite of the fact that these youth have indicated strong attachments to their families. In addition, for those participants not attached to their peers, peer relationships do not serve as a source of control, and fail to influence behaviour. While the youth voiced confirmation of understanding norms and values, they rationalize law breaking behaviour, leaving them less likely to be deterred.

The examination of formal methods of control revealed that extensive previous police contact has resulted in a lack of respect toward the police, which may increase criminal behaviour as a result of defiant reactions on the part of the young offenders. Exposure to the criminal justice system may serve as a deterrent to 'naive' offenders; however, repeated exposure may diminish the impact of the formal process, causing the offender to become increasingly nonchalant. In general, offenders perceive the likelihood of apprehension as low. In addition, participants are not likely to be deterred by the threat of a boot camp, as the perceived severity of the punishment is low. Findings are discussed in terms of policy recommendations.

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank the Department of Sociology and Anthropology for allowing me the opportunity to participate in their graduate program. In particular, I would like to thank Dr. Stephen Baron, my advisor, for his encouragement, guidance, patience, and dedication. His genuine commitment to teaching students has not gone unnoticed. I would also like to thank Dr. Alan Sears and Professor Bernie Kroeker for their unfailing support and commitment to this research project. A student could not have asked for a better committee of advisors.

Many thanks to Sue McGilveary, Andrea Turner, and Perry Pittao, for their years of providing support to students within the department. They were always there with a cheerful word and often went above and beyond what was required of them.

To the many friends and peers who helped and inspired me — Scott Rogers, Shelley Young, Joel Harden, and Dave Bell to name a few — thanks for being there when needed. Special thanks to Joel Duff for the proofreading, along with his insightful comments.

Finally, many thanks to my family. Without their support and encouragement, I would not be where I am today. And to Brianne, you are my inspiration.

Table of Contents

Abstract	iii
Acknowledgement	iv
List of Tables	vii
Chapter 1. Introduction	1
Public Attitudes Toward Youth Crime	2
History of Juvenile Justice in Canada	6
Significance of the Study	8
Chapter 2. Theoretical Considerations	11
Review of the Literature	15
<i>Formal Sanctions</i>	19
<i>Informal Sanctions</i>	20
Limitations of the Literature	23
Summary of the Literature	24
Chapter 3. Methodology	27
Research Design	27
Data Analysis	29
Reliability and Validity	30
<i>Reliability</i>	30
<i>Internal Validity</i>	31
<i>External Validity</i>	32
Chapter 4. Findings	33
Background	33

Informal Social Control	36
<i>School</i>	36
<i>Employment</i>	42
<i>Attachment to Significant Others</i>	49
<i>Peers</i>	59
<i>Morality</i>	64
Formal Social Control	74
<i>Relations with Police</i>	74
<i>Experience within the Criminal Justice System</i>	77
<i>Certainty of Punishment</i>	86
<i>Severity of Punishment</i>	95
<i>Perceived Fairness of Punishment</i>	101
<i>Deterrent Effect of a Boot Camp</i>	106
Program Recommendations	110
 Chapter 5. Conclusion	114
Overview	114
Summary of Findings	115
<i>Informal Social Control</i>	115
<i>Formal Social Control</i>	119
Recommendations	125
 Appendixes	129
Appendix 1 - Letter of Permission	129
Appendix 2 - Informed Consent Form	130
Appendix 3 - Interview Schedule	131
 References	133
 Vita Auctoris	150

List of Tables

Table 1 - Self Reported Criminal History	35
Table 2 - Previous Employment Cited	43
Table 3 - School Attendance and Previous Work Experience	44
Table 4 - Preferred Employment of Participants	46
Table 5 - Participant's Residential History Prior to Custody	50
Table 6 - Parental Employment	51
Table 7 - Combined Parental Employment	52
Table 8 - Quality of Relationship with Parents	54
Table 9 - Attachment to Peers	61
Table 10 - Morality and Experiential Effect (Robbery)	66
Table 11 - Morality and Experiential Effect (Assault)	68
Table 12 - Morality and Experiential Effect (Break and Enter)	70
Table 13 - Experiential Effect and Court Experiences	78
Table 14 - Experiential Effect and Perceptions of Facility	82
Table 15 - Certainty of Punishment and Experiential Effect (Robbery)	87
Table 16 - Certainty of Punishment and Experiential Effect (Assault)	89
Table 17 - Certainty of Punishment and Experiential Effect (Break and Enter)	91

Chapter 1.

Introduction

'We're doing all youth a disservice by not having a bit of tough love. So much for hugs and kisses. The hugs and kisses haven't worked and besides that, the hugs and kisses have cost taxpayers billions.' Ontario's Youth Crime Control Commission's, Jim Brown, in defending the punitive nature of the commission's recommendations, pressing for a range of new measures against youth crime, including the public shaming of teen criminals, letting victims sue the offender's parents, lowering the minimum and maximum ages of young offenders to ten and fifteen years old, and setting up citizens' sentencing courts.

(Blackwell, 1998: A1)

Canadians have increasingly come to perceive that violent youth crime is rising (Corrado and Markwart, 1994: 349). Capitalizing on public perceptions, the Ontario government has recently introduced a pilot program of 'strict discipline' for serious, violent young offenders. The stated purpose of this program is to reduce crime by deterring young offenders (Ontario Ministry of the Solicitor General and Correctional Services, 1996: 1). Shortly after the implementation of this program, the Ministry of the Solicitor General and Correctional Services released new 'Strict and Structured' guidelines in order to transfer the law and order structure from the pilot boot camp to all corrections facilities for sixteen and seventeen year old youth (Power, 1998: 5). However, evaluations of the deterrent effect of

such sanctions have suggested that the failure to consider legal or formal sanctions within a more complete conceptual framework promotes simple crime control strategies to solve complex problems (Bishop, 1984: 403-404). It is necessary to examine the deterrent effects of a broader set of both formal and informal sanctions on young offenders in order to evaluate the assumptions of the deterrent effect of punishment. This study will attempt to explore the effectiveness of the threat of punishment in deterring young offenders from criminal activity. However, an increasing amount of literature on deterrence theory indicates that informal sanctions may be as important, or even more important, than formal sanctions (Bishop, 1984; Paternoster and Iovanni, 1986). It has been suggested that the fear of disapproval by significant others is greater than the fear of formal sanctions (Grasmick et al., 1993: 44). Consequently, this analysis will examine both formal and informal deterrence systems.

Public Attitudes Toward Youth Crime

In recent years, an increasing number of people have come to perceive that rates of crime, especially youth crime, are rising. Data from the 1993 General Social Survey (GSS) suggest that there is a general public perception of an increase in the level of crime in Canada (Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, 1995; Corrado and Markwart, 1994). However, the 1993 GSS results indicate no increase in actual victimization (Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, 1994; Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, 1995). Thus, there appears to be little connection between an increase in experienced victimization and public fear of victimization.

In contrast to public perception, long term research has found no increase in the per capita rate of youth homicide in Canada between the 1970's and 1990 (Silverman, 1990; Silverman and Kennedy, 1993). Violent youth crime is not running rampant in Canada, and non-violent crime constitutes the majority of youth offences (Corrado and Markwart, 1994). According to the Department of Justice, the overall youth crime rate across Canada's rural and urban neighbourhoods is declining (Government of Canada, 1999a: 1). Between 1991 and 1997, the charge rate for young people dropped from 643 to 495 per 10,000 youth in the

population — a twenty-three percent decrease. While this decrease was mostly in property crimes, it was reported that the violent crime rate slightly increased over this same period from 83 to 91 per 10,000 youth. However, since peaking in 1995, the charge rate for violent crimes has decreased by 3.2 percent (Government of Canada, 1999a: 1).

At its peak, Carrington (1995) argued that the reported increase in violent youth crime was the result of a combination of factors. While the police propensity to report violent offences is relatively stable over the years, Carrington (1995: 65) suggests that the equation of 'crimes against the person' and 'violence' produces an inaccurate portrayal of violent offences. Carrington (1995) argues that the reported increase in violent youth crime is concentrated in mainly non-violent offences against the person — those incidents of assault which result in no demonstrable harm or injury to a complainant. The majority of serious offences against the person, including homicide, attempted murder, aggravated sexual assault, robbery, and miscellaneous offences against the person, remained stable. However, Carrington (1995: 65) did report that assaults causing harm, including aggravated assault, assault causing bodily harm, assault with a weapon, and unlawfully causing bodily harm, was the one category that did substantially increase in the number of police reported offences. Carrington (1995: 71) describes this pattern as part of a larger trend, and not unique to young offenders.

Further, several surveys of public attitudes toward juvenile justice in Canada have revealed that there is a high degree of punitive attitudes toward young offenders. These high levels of punitive attitudes are not related to past victimization experiences (Hartnagel and Baron, 1995; Baron and Hartnagel, 1996). Instead, conservative social values and belief in the deterrent value of punishment are associated with more punitive attitudes toward young offenders (Hartnagel and Baron, 1995: 55; Baron and Hartnagel, 1996: 203). Spratt (1996: 285) found that the public perceives the Young Offenders Act (YOA) to be too lenient, and suggests that attitudes have been influenced by an over-representation of unusual violent youth crimes in the media.

The media has been instrumental in heightening public fear and anxiety about youth crime and the inadequacies of the YOA (Corrado and Markwart, 1994: 345). According to

Hylton (1994: 239), the media has mounted an all out assault on the YOA. The 1992 release of a Statistics Canada publication (Frank, 1992) on violent youth crime provides a prime example. This report indicated that the per capita rate of youth violence had doubled since 1986 (Frank, 1992: 4). This report received immediate media attention; however, the media failed to report that minor assaults accounted for about half of all violent offence charges against youth in 1991 (Hornberger, 1994; Smrke, 1995).

The media's presentation of an unrepresentative range of crimes to the public greatly influences perceptions of crime. Compared to police statistics, news coverage of serious violent crimes is over represented (Spratt, 1996: 273). In addition, the presentation of the story may influence the perceptions and attitudes of the audience (Hartnagel and Baron, 1995: 56). Factors such as characteristics of the offender, the charge, and the disposition are important in understanding the true nature of the incident in order to evaluate the appropriateness of the news story (Spratt, 1996: 274). Research has demonstrated that media reports of crimes exclude relevant information (Spratt, 1996: 274).

The media also serves to shape public attitudes and opinions by defining youth crime issues in an oversimplified and punitive manner (Baron and Hartnagel, 1996: 207). This indicates that the media can be influential in shaping the views of the public on attitudes toward appropriate forms of punishments for young offenders, which may have contributed to the high level of support for the introduction of boot camps in Ontario. The public perception that youth crime is rising has contributed to the popularity of the right-wing anti-crime platform of the Ontario Progressive Conservative government (Ontario Ministry of the Solicitor General and Correctional Services, 1996). To illustrate, a 1995 Angus-Reid poll revealed that more than eight in ten Ontario residents support the use of boot camps for violent young offenders (Brennan, 1995: A4).

On November 20, 1995, the Hon. Robert Runciman, Ontario's Solicitor General and Minister of Correctional Services, appointed a Task Force on Strict Discipline for Young Offenders. This task force was mandated to make recommendations on: 1) How a program of strict discipline should be developed for the custody, management, and treatment of young offenders; 2) How to create strict discipline models that establish standards for

security, work, and basic skills training to maximize the self-worth and rehabilitation of young offenders by cost-effective means; and 3) How to implement such recommendations within the existing budgets of the Ministry of the Solicitor General and Correctional Services young offender programming (Ontario Ministry of the Solicitor General and Correctional Services, 1996: 1). It is apparent from the directed mandate that this task force was not created to provide an evaluation of the effectiveness of this type of formal sanction for young offenders: rather, this report clearly indicates that the purpose of the task force was to determine how to implement such a program. Following the 1997 implementation of a boot camp program, the provincial government released new 'Strict and Structured' guidelines in order to take the law and order line from the pilot program and implement it in all correctional facilities for sixteen and seventeen year olds (Power, 1998). More recently, a provincial government commission has recommended new 'get tough' measures on youth crime, including public shaming of teen criminals, lowering the age of a young offender from twelve to seventeen years old, to ten to fifteen years old, setting up citizen sentencing courts able to mete out curfews, restitution, and taking away drivers' licenses (Blackwell, 1998: A1).

According to Recommendations From the Task Force on Strict Discipline for Young Offenders, the report submitted to the Ontario Solicitor General and Minister of Correctional Services, "there is widespread public support in Ontario to adopt strict discipline measures for young offenders" (Ontario Ministry of the Solicitor General and Correctional Services, 1996: 1). Consequently, the provincial government introduced "Project Turnaround," in order to provide an intensive, highly-structured, and a physically-rigorous rehabilitation program (Brennan, 1997: A12).

Strict discipline programs have been touted by the government as practical and effective programs in order to deter young offenders from crime, reduce recidivism, and reduce the high costs associated with incarcerating young offenders (Ontario Ministry of the Solicitor General and Correctional Services, 1996). These strict discipline programs are premised on the theory that participants will be "shocked" into working hard and respecting authority, resulting in physically fit, healthy graduates with increased self-esteem, pride, and

self-discipline. Shock incarceration, or a strict discipline program, is generally lauded by the public and politicians as an effective strategy to deter young offenders from re-offending and to get tough on what is seen to be an increasing number of young offenders breaking the law.

History of Juvenile Justice in Canada

The widespread acceptance of the philosophy that shock incarceration is an acceptable form of punishment for young offenders reflects a recent trend in Canadian corrections. The Canadian juvenile justice system has traditionally favoured a rehabilitative model of corrections (Clark and O'Reilly-Fleming, 1993: 115). Retribution, or the “just deserts” model, has not been associated with juvenile justice in Canada since prior to the introduction of the Juvenile Delinquents Act (JDA) in 1908.

The JDA emphasized the doctrine of “*parens patriae*,” which literally placed the family court judge in the position of the parent (Caputo, 1987; Clark and O'Reilly-Fleming, 1993). The JDA was built on the philosophy that the juvenile delinquent needed encouragement and assistance rather than punishment. Subsequently, the JDA came under criticism because of the extensive power it granted the court for dealing with young people and its inefficiency in preventing delinquency and rehabilitating delinquents (Caputo, 1987). Growing dissatisfaction with the JDA among police, provincial governments, and non-governmental social service agencies resulted in an extensive consultation process by the federal government with the ten provincial and territorial juvenile justice systems through the 1960's and 1970's (Havemann, 1986: 228). The 1961 Correctional Planning Report of the Department of Justice, the 1965 Department of Justice Committee on Juvenile Delinquency, the 1967 Draft Act, Bill C-192 1970, the 1975 Liberal proposals, and the 1977 Conservative proposals revealed a lack of consensus among lobby groups about which philosophy should be adopted — the treatment, civil libertarian, or the law and order model (Havemann, 1986: 228).

The culmination of this consulting process was the 1984 enactment of the Young Offenders Act. The YOA required that judges explicitly consider accountability and the

protection of society as factors in sentencing youth (Bala, 1994). The YOA reflected a compromise between the opposing rehabilitative and retributive camps, accommodating the rights of the young offender while legitimating coercive measures through an emphasis on individual accountability (Havemann, 1986; Clark and O'Reilly-Fleming, 1993). Despite the rehabilitative ideals and objectives espoused in the YOA, such as alternative measures programs, the sentencing practices of youth court judges have consistently favoured a retributive model (Clark and O'Reilly-Fleming, 1993: 116).

In the late 1980's, the YOA became the centre of public debate, directed primarily at the perceived inadequacy of the maximum three year sentence for violent offenders, and the difficulty of transferring youth into the adult system in order to apply longer dispositions (Corrado et al., 1992: 24). In June of 1994, the Minister of Justice at the time, the Honourable Allan Rock, proposed a number of amendments to the YOA (Bill C-37), which were passed and enacted December 1, 1995. These amendments included: increasing first and second degree murder sentences to a maximum of ten and seven years, respectively; automatic transfer to adult court for sixteen and seventeen year old youths charged with serious personal injury offences, with a reverse onus on the young offender to prove that the offender should stay in youth court; an increase in parole ineligibility from five to ten years for youths convicted in adult court for first or second degree murder; and more records retained for longer periods for serious offences (House of Commons of Canada, 1994: 1a). More recently, the Liberal government announced another overhaul of the youth justice system, including increased police discretion not to charge first-time and non-violent offenders, alternatives to the formal court system for youths accused of minor criminal behaviour, and more community-based sentencing. These reforms also include tougher sanctions for serious and violent offenders, including automatic adult sentences for fourteen to seventeen year olds, along with the publication of their names in the media, unless ruled otherwise by the judge (Bindman and Bronskill, 1998: A1; Tibbetts, 1999: D10).

This youth justice system overhaul was introduced as the Youth Criminal Justice Act in the House of Commons by the Honourable Anne McLellan, Minister of Justice, on March 11, 1999 (Government of Canada, 1999b: 1). The Department of Justice describes the new

Youth Criminal Justice Act as follows:

The *Youth Criminal Justice Act* is based on an accountability framework that promotes consequences for crime that are proportionate to the seriousness of the offence. More serious offenders could receive adult sentences or sentences of custody. Less serious offenders will be dealt with through measures outside the court process or be subject to constructive community-based sentences or alternatives. The Act emphasizes that, in all cases, youth should face consequences that promote responsibility and accountability to the victim and the community and teach good values by helping the young person understand the effect of his or her actions (Government of Canada, 1999c: 1).

The key focus underlying this new Act is the principle of fairness — that the sentence the youth receives should be in proportion to the seriousness of the offence, with the emphasis on punishment, rather than rehabilitation.

In light of the trend, both in public opinion and political response, toward greater emphasis upon punishment in dealing with young offenders, one must question the appropriateness of such a reaction. With the provincial government once again capitalizing on a 'tough on crime' platform during the 1999 provincial election, it is necessary to examine this emphasis on punishment (PC's stake out crime as issue, 1999; Crime fears give Conservatives a 'wedge,' 1999). Evidently, the political response to public pressure has been to increase sanctions on young offenders without regard to the "what works" debate in criminological research (Leschied and Gendreau; 1993).

Significance of the Study

The introduction of a strict discipline program is reflective of the increasing emphasis on punishment and punitiveness. Within this context, it is particularly relevant to explore the effectiveness of the threat of punishment in deterring young offenders from criminal activity. Twenty young offenders, incarcerated in an open-custody facility, were interviewed using an interview schedule grounded in deterrence literature. Deterrence theory posits that the certainty, severity, and celerity of punishment will affect the offender's decision to commit further offences. In contrast, rather than attempting to prevent criminal behaviour through the threat of punishment, social control theories attempt to explain

criminal behaviour by identifying social factors which prevent people from committing deviant behaviour. This analysis will examine both formal and informal deterrence systems.

A qualitative examination is momentous considering the current political climate. The provincial government is attempting to control young offenders by implementing a type of formal sanction, a strict discipline program, for which the implementation is based on the premise that fear of punishment will deter offenders from crime. Claims that strict discipline programs will serve as a deterrent to young offenders require a closer examination. This assumption must be examined in order to determine its efficacy. In fact, the literature on shock incarceration indicates that the recidivism rates of shock incarceration graduates, paroled inmates, and probationers are similar (Shaw and MacKenzie, 1992). Thus, research indicates that the military model is no more successful in deterring offenders than either probation or incarceration.

If shock incarceration, a formal sanction, does not serve as an effective deterrent, it is possible that the punishment becomes a reflection of the community's sense of retribution. This thesis asserts that it is necessary to examine the deterrent effect of both formal and informal types of punishment within the boundaries of social control. Consequently, this evaluation has also included informal sanctions as alternatives or complements to formal sanctions. A growing amount of literature on deterrence theory indicates that informal sanctions may be as important, or even more important, than formal sanctions (Bishop, 1984; Paternoster and Iovanni, 1986).

A review of the literature on deterrence theory reveals a dearth of qualitative research. The overwhelming majority of research has been quantitative; consequently, it is anticipated that a qualitative methodology will provide an opportunity for insights not available in the quantitative work. The use of a semi-structured interview schedule allows for flexibility within the interview, providing an opportunity to the participants to interject data. Commonly marginalized, the perspective of this population is often not investigated, in part due to their youth, their lower class background, and their offender status. Enabling the offender population to vocalize perspectives on the issue of crime and punishment allows for the inclusion of data that might not be uncovered utilizing typical quantitative

research techniques.

This sample of young offenders has been derived from an at-risk population — residents of an open-custody facility. Conceivably, the graduates of an open custody facility are the target population for strict discipline programs. The pilot project, Project Turnaround, targets high-risk offenders who have previously served at least one custodial sentence (open or secure), have reoffended, and have been sentenced to a period of secure custody of at least four months (Ontario Ministry of the Solicitor General and Correctional Services, 1996: 10). This is important, not only because it is the target population, but also because the literature suffers from a lack of evidence about known offenders (Decker, Wright, and Logie, 1993). Significantly, this research will target potential participants of the strict discipline program. In order to provide a theoretical overview, deterrence within a framework of social control theory will be briefly reviewed.

Chapter 2.

Theoretical Considerations

'Since any review of theories is in reality a history of social thought, a combination of factors needs to be taken into account. The ideas should be followed from theory to theory, the various classifications examined to see how they overlap and how they differ, and the contexts analysed to gain a feel for the assumptions made by the theorists.'

(Williams and McShane, 1994: 11)

Deterrence theory is based on early classical theory's premise of rationality (Williams and McShane, 1994: 14). Classical theory is premised upon the assumption that human beings are rational actors, deliberately weighing the benefits of a criminal act with the risk and cost associated with punishment and arrest. According to the classical school, punishment is justified by its deterrent ability. Deterrence theory is premised upon three criteria of punishment; namely, that the greater the certainty, severity, and celerity of punishment, the greater the effectiveness of the deterrence system (Geerken and Gove, 1975: 500). The certainty, severity, and celerity of punishment indicate how likely, how severe, and how immediate punishment will be implemented. Considered within a rational-choice model, if the expected advantage or utility of criminal behaviour is greater than the expected cost of the action, the person will engage in the criminal behaviour (Piliavin et al., 1986: 102). Thus, in order to deter the offender, the expected cost of the action must outweigh the

perceived benefits of the act. The threat of strict discipline has been imposed as a deterrent, which is intended to outweigh the benefits of the crime.

Formal deterrence systems communicate the message of the risk of application of legal enforcement of previously defined negative sanctions for the violation of explicitly codified rules and laws (Geerken and Gove, 1975: 499). In addition to strict discipline programs, formal deterrents include legal sanctions such as police contact, arrest, conviction, and sentences such as fines, probation, and incarceration. Deterrence theory posits that the use of these sanctions as deterrents to crime are dependent upon perceptions of the certainty, severity, and celerity of each punishment. Legal punishments have traditionally been implemented to deter criminal behaviour. More recently, social control theories have been utilized in order to examine informal methods of control.

Rather than attempting to prevent crime by threat of punishment, social control theories explain criminal behaviour by identifying social factors that prevent people from committing deviant behaviour (Williams and McShane, 1994: 181). Accordingly, social control theories emphasize the quality of the process of socialization, as indicated through adherence to rules and norms. Hirschi's (1969) social bonding theory argues that internalized norms, conscience, and the desire for approval encourage conventional behaviour. Hirschi's concept of the social bond was premised on the assumption that individuals become free to commit crimes when their ties to society are broken or diminished. That is, those who are not bonded to society are more likely to commit criminal acts than those with strong social bonds to society.

Hirschi (1969) characterized the social bond as having four elements or dimensions: attachment, involvement, commitment, and belief. Attachment indicates the strength of emotional and psychological ties one has to significant others, including parents, friends, role models, and institutions. The greater the bond of attachment to significant others, the greater adherence to norms and values, thereby decreasing the likelihood of deviance.

Involvement indicates the degree of activity available for conventional or unconventional behaviour. Those occupied by conventional activities are less likely to become involved in criminal activity. To exemplify, boredom has commonly been cited as

a factor favourable to criminal activity, while fun and excitement, factors which may serve to alleviate boredom, are often cited as explanations for committing criminal acts (LeBlanc and Fréchette, 1989; Ladouceur and Biron, 1993).

Commitment represents the investment one has already built up in conventional society. The potential losses in the investments in conformity are weighed against the possible profits of criminal behaviour. Young offenders often have fewer commitments to society. Socioeconomic status impacts on level of commitment, as opportunities offered to middle-and upper-class youth result in firm commitments to society through educational opportunities, successful employment, and a high standard of living. Opportunities offered to lower-class youth, by comparison, are minimal, therefore losses in investments are overshadowed by the possible profit of criminal behaviour.

The final element of the social bond, belief, represents respect for societal rules and norms. The internalization of conventional values, norms, and laws of society restrain people from committing crime. Belief implies an unquestioning indoctrination of the prevailing norms and values, resulting in adherence to the laws of order. If these societal rules are not imparted through socialization, or if these rules are not successfully internalized by the individual, the bond is weak, increasing the likelihood of criminal behaviour.

Other social control theorists argue that the primary determinant of conformity is moral commitment to norms or social values (Tittle, 1977). According to one interpretation of this presupposition, the internalization of moral commitment (belief) is such a powerful inhibitor that it prevents all criminal motivation. Therefore, individuals who have internalized a norm will not violate it even if they perceive legal punishment as unlikely (Grasmick and Green, 1980). Consequently, the threat of legal punishment may only have a deterrent effect upon those individuals who are not morally committed to the law (Grasmick and Green, 1980: 328).

A complementary perspective proposes that individuals take into account whether they would feel ashamed if they engaged in a particular behaviour (Grasmick and Bursik, 1990). Shame is defined as a self-imposed sanction, occurring when an individual violates norms that they have internalized, and experience the pain of guilt or remorse (Grasmick,

Bursik, and Arneklev, 1993: 41). The violation of an internalization of a norm or moral commitment results in the self-imposed punishment — shame.

Braithwaite's (1989) theory of reintegrative shaming adopts an active conception of the offender, who is seen as making choices to commit crime, to join a subculture, to adopt a deviant self-concept, to reintegrate oneself, and to respond to others' gestures of reintegration against a background of societal pressures by shaming. Braithwaite suggests that crime is best controlled when members of the community are the primary controllers through active participation in shaming offenders and concerted participation in ways of reintegrating the offender back into the community of law-abiding citizens (Braithwaite, 1989: 8). Reintegrative shaming controls crime, whereas stigmatic shaming increases it. Stigmatic shaming creates outcasts, in which the 'criminal' trait becomes a master status overriding other identities (Braithwaite, 1993: 1). This is reflective of the widely held practice of affirming that the offender is not 'bad' because of the action, rather the act was bad. In effect, labelling the offender as deviant results in the creation of a stigma associated with the individual, thereby cutting the offender off from conventional ties.

In addition to shaming as an informal source of control, embarrassment can also be examined with reference to significant others — those individuals who have significant importance to the offender. Embarrassment is a socially imposed sanction that occurs when the offender violates a norm endorsed by significant others who become aware of the actors' transgressions. Embarrassment is experienced as the pain of stigma or loss of respect from others (Grasmick, Bursik, and Arneklev, 1993: 44), not unlike Braithwaite's stigmatic shaming. Social control theory predicts that a person is less likely to commit an offence if significant others (parents, peers) disapprove of the action. In fact, some suggest, the fear of disapproval is greater than the fear of formal sanctions (Grasmick et al., 1993: 44).

In the event that the offender's behaviour is not affected by shame or embarrassment, defiance might also be considered. Sherman (1993: 459) defines defiance as the net increase in the prevalence, incidence, or seriousness of future offending against a sanctioning community caused by a proud, shameless reaction to the administration of a criminal sanction. According to Sherman (1993), defiance occurs under four necessary conditions:

1) The offender defines a criminal sanction as being unfair, that is, when the sanctioning agent behaves with disrespect toward the offender, or the sanction is substantively arbitrary, discriminatory, excessive, undeserved, or otherwise objectively unjust; 2) The offender is poorly bonded to, or is alienated from, the sanctioning agent or the community the agent represents; 3) The offender defines the sanction as stigmatizing and rejecting a person, not a lawbreaking act; and 4) The offender denies or refuses to acknowledge the shame the sanction has actually caused the offender to suffer. Defiance is especially relevant to an examination of a young offender population. This theory implies that the arbitrary implementation of formal sanctions may lead the offender to act defiantly against the sanctioning agent or community, thereby counteracting any deterrent effect.

It is evident that deterrence theory and social control theory attempt to uncover factors which may result in preventing or reducing criminal activity. While the application of deterrence theory attempts to prevent crime based on the certainty, severity and celerity of the threat of punishment, the application of social control theories attempts to control behaviour based on socialization and the internalization of norms and values. The available literature on deterrence and social control theory will now be reviewed.

Review of the Literature

Early research on the deterrent effect of certainty and severity of punishment used aggregate level data.¹ Aggregate level research is based on aggregate properties of crime and punishment such as the Uniform Crime Reports and National Prisoner Statistics (Grasmick and Green, 1980). For example, Singer and McDowall's (1988) analysis of the introduction of New York State's Juvenile Offender Law (1978) revealed that even though the risk and severity of punishment increased, it failed to influence crime rates. Similarly, Jensen and Metsger's (1994) analysis of the deterrent effect of the introduction of legislation initiating automatic transfers of juveniles to adult court indicated that the introduction of legislative waiver policies also failed to deter violent juvenile crime (Jensen and Metsger, 1994: 102).

Aggregate level research has been critiqued on a number of points (Greenberg,

Kessler, and Logan, 1981). First, it is difficult to refine measures of the threat of sanctions when relying on a secondary analysis of data gathered by government agencies (Grasmick, 1981). It is generally accepted that official crime rates are sensitive to changes in rates of reporting crime to police, changes in the recording and charging practices of the police, and population demographics (Waldo and Chiricos, 1972: 524). Second, variables that are theoretically important, such as moral commitment and threat of social disapproval, are not measured in aggregate level analyses (Grasmick, 1981). Third, this research cannot capture the perceptual aspect of the theory (Grasmick and Green, 1980; Grasmick and Bryjak, 1980; Minor and Harry, 1982). Consequently, deterrence research shifted from aggregate to individual level research.

The literature differentiates between deterring the general public from criminal activity and deterring offenders from reoffending. General deterrence is achieved when the threat of legal sanctions deters the commission of potential crimes by people other than punished offenders (Griffiths and Verdun-Jones, 1994: 407-408). General deterrence implies a legal theory of crime control, targeting potential offenders in order to prevent crime (Williams and Hawkins, 1986; Stafford and Warr, 1993). General deterrence can both prevent criminal behaviour — absolute deterrence, and reduce levels of criminal behaviour — restrictive deterrence. Absolute deterrence refers to the total avoidance of a criminal act because of the perceived certainty and severity of sanctions (Paternoster, 1989b: 290). For example, if the youth perceives punishment in a strict discipline program to be highly likely and severe, therefore avoiding criminal activity, absolute deterrence has occurred. Restrictive deterrence refers to the reduced frequency of criminal behaviour as a result of the perception of risk and punishment (Paternoster, 1989b: 290). While the young offender may still commit at least one criminal offence, a reduced frequency of criminal activity reflects a deterrent effect.

The prevention of crime based on general deterrence is caused by fear of direct sanctions (Williams and Hawkins, 1986). The threat of a strict discipline program as a punishment would serve as a general deterrent if it prevents youths from committing crimes based on fear of the threat of the imposition of the sanction. However, perceptions of

certainty of punishment vary among youth, dependent upon their own experience, and the experience of their peers. Claster (1967) discovered early on that delinquents perceive their chances of apprehension and conviction to be less than non-delinquents perceive their own chances. Since then, other studies have found that individuals with experience in committing an offence have lower estimates of the risk of punishment than those with no such experience (Bridges and Stone, 1986; Horney and Marshall, 1992). Claster (1967) concluded that the delinquents' lower estimate of arrest probability was a form of perceptual distortion, resulting in a perception of immunity or invulnerability of arrest. This conclusion has since been challenged. More recently, the offender's perception of the threat of punishment has been accepted as a realistic reflection of actual arrest rates, and higher estimates of non-offenders are viewed as exaggerated estimates of certainty of punishment (Paternoster et al., 1985).

Additionally, the research indicates a strong causal loop between delinquency and associations with delinquent peers (Thornberry et al., 1994). It follows that the offender's perception of risk is influenced by association with delinquent peers. Vicarious experience of sanctions, including communications of risk, impacts upon the offenders perception of risk (Horney and Marshall, 1992). Parker and Grasmick (1979), for example, include arrests of others known to the individual, when considering an individual's risk perception.

Similarly, those with little prior experience in personally committing an offence, or little contact with offenders, have higher estimates of the certainty of punishment than those with experience (Paternoster et al., 1985; Horney and Marshall, 1992). Bridges and Stone's (1986) examination of experiential effect found that the effects of punishment on offenders are greatest among naive offenders, for whom punishment increases perceived threat. However, the naive offenders, upon committing offences and getting away with them, substantially lower their estimates of the risks involved (Minor and Harry, 1982). This has significant implications for the introduction of strict discipline for repeat offenders. This research indicates that first-time offenders may be more effectively deterred than serious offenders (Tittle and Logan, 1973; Paternoster et al., 1985; Bridges and Stone, 1986). In fact, among experienced offenders, the effects of punishment run counter to the prediction

of specific deterrence (Thomas and Bishop, 1984; Bridges and Stone, 1986). Punishment has no substantial direct effect on perceived threat and may actually lower perceived threat by increasing approval of criminal behaviour (Bridges and Stone, 1986: 230).

Consequently, deterrence theory must consider differing individual perceptions of fear of punishment. The threat of punishment does not have the same meaning for all people (Grasmick and Bryjak, 1980: 475; McClelland and Alpert, 1985: 316). Thus, what is seen as costly or threatening to one person may be insignificant to others. As a result of this, deterrence theory must also consider the perceptual aspect of behaviour, emphasizing the effects of punishment on the individual offender.

Specific deterrence occurs when a convicted offender is deterred from committing further offences as a consequence of his or her personal experience with punishment (Griffiths and Verdun-Jones, 1994: 407). Specific deterrence posits that punishment aides in reducing criminal recidivism by heightening the perceived individual threat of punishment (Bridges and Stone, 1986). It is assumed by politicians and the public that graduation from a strict discipline program would serve as a specific deterrent to the individual young offender (Ontario Ministry of the Solicitor General and Correctional Services, 1996: 4). According to specific deterrence, one would predict that the experience of a boot camp would be sufficiently negative that it would deter the youth from engaging in future criminal behaviour in order to prevent readmission to the program. The government has targeted high-risk, repeat offenders in order to prove the value of strict discipline (Ontario Ministry of the Solicitor General and Correctional Services, 1996: 10).

However, one must consider how perceptions of the threat of punishment influences involvement in crime. Perceptions of the severity of punishment also vary, depending on the offender. Grasmick and Bryjak (1980: 475) also claim that a particular punishment does not have the same meaning for all people. For example, the punishment of strict discipline would not be felt as equally costly by all individuals. Similarly, Carmody and Williams (1987) found that repeat offenders perceive arrest as less severe than do one-time offenders. Accordingly, a punishment which might deter some people may be perceived as only a minor inconvenience, or even a reward, to others.

Formal Sanctions

Deterrence theory predicts that the greater the certainty of punishment, and the greater the severity of punishment, the greater the probability that the individual will be deterred from crime. Deterrence theory primarily focuses on formal sanctions in order to reduce the occurrence of crime. In general, early deterrence literature demonstrated reasonable support for an association between the perceived certainty or risk of criminal punishment and offending by offence, but little support for the association between crime and the severity of punishment.²

A growing quantity of more recent research has cast doubt on early deterrence theory findings. More recent research suggests that perceived risk of punishment plays virtually no role in inhibiting minor criminal behaviour (Minor and Harry, 1982; Paternoster et al., 1983; Lanza-Kaduce, 1988), and may increase subsequent criminal behaviour (Klemke, 1978; Schneider and Ervin, 1990). However, an examination of serious offenders committing major felonies demonstrated an inverse relationship between participation in an offence and the perceived risk of arrest for that offence (Horney and Marshall, 1992). This study, examining experiential effects, found that perceptions are formed in a rational manner, in that the likelihood of arrest is based on how many times a person has been able to commit the crime without being arrested (Horney and Marshall, 1992).

The early tendency to disregard severity as an important aspect of deterrence was censured by Grasmick and Bryjak (1980). In contradiction to other research on severity, Teevan (1976a, 1976b), Grasmick and Bryjak (1980) and Decker, Wright, and Logie (1993) found that, when combined with a high certainty of arrest, perceived severity of punishment was a significant variable in the social control process. In contrast, Paternoster and Iovanni (1986) found that social control works primarily through informal processes. Once informal processes are controlled, perceptions of the severity and certainty of punishment have no effect on delinquent behaviour (Paternoster and Iovanni, 1986: 768).

Deterrence theory also proposes that there is an inverse relationship between the celerity of formal legal punishment and crime (Paternoster, 1989a: 7). Celerity has long been considered an important element of deterrence, as it facilitates the development of a

causal association between the offence and the punishment (Clark, 1988: 110). Notwithstanding, celerity has been largely ignored by perceptual studies, in part because of the methodological difficulties in collecting data on a large number of cases to determine the case flow and time between the various decision points (Selke, 1983).

Examinations of the specific deterrence of celerity have been conflicting. Selke (1983), Pestello (1984), and Howe and Brandau (1988) found limited or inconsistent empirical support for the ability of celerity to individually deter criminal behaviour. However, Gray et al. (1982), Miranne and Gray (1987), Schneider and Ervin (1990), and Yu (1994) all found the opposite effect — a longer time lag between the offence and the disposition results in fewer subsequent offences. A possible explanation for the findings in opposition to the theory indicates that the delay may result in an amplification of apprehension for the unexperienced punishment, thereby serving as a stronger deterrent (Gray et al., 1982: 211).

Informal Sanctions

Informal systems of deterrence operate largely through interpersonal communication and typically involve sanctions at the interpersonal level (Geerken and Gove, 1975: 499). Geerken and Gove (1975: 499) indicated early on that the importance of the informal system and its degree of compatibility or incompatibility with the formal system should be taken into account when assessing deterrent effects. A growing amount of deterrence literature has indicated that informal sources of social control such as peer behaviour, moral beliefs, and social disapproval are more strongly related to criminal behaviour than the fear of formal sanctions (Bishop, 1984; Paternoster and Iovanni, 1986; Green, 1989c; Gertz and Gould, 1995). “The emerging conclusion appears to be that the effect of legal sanction threat is not as great as the effects of variables from other theories, and, in fact, the perceived threat of legal sanctions might have no deterrent effect at all” (Grasmick and Bursik, 1990: 838).

It has been determined that the threat of shame and moral commitment to the law inhibits illegal behaviour (Paternoster, 1986; Green, 1989b, 1989c; Grasmick and Bursik,

1990; Grasmick, Bursik, and Cochran, 1991; Grasmick, Bursik, and Arneklev, 1993). Parents and peers threaten law violators by threatening to inflict embarrassment or loss of respect, thereby reducing the utility of the crime (Grasmick, Bursik, and Cochran, 1991: 253). In addition, parents are responsible for promoting pro-social actions and empathic responses in the child, representing the promotion of attachment to norms and values and commitment to conventional society (McDevitt, Lennon, and Kopriva, 1991). The threat of social disapproval by significant others is significantly inversely related to criminal behaviour (Green, 1989b). As might be expected, Paternoster (1988) found that parents' influence tends to wane over the high school period, while friends' influence became slightly stronger.

However, Grasmick and Bursik (1990) did not find a significant inverse direct effect on the threat of embarrassment. Greenberg (1989a) found that the threat of social disapproval appears to have an effect on behaviour examined by a cross-sectional model, yet effect diminishes significantly using panel data one year later. Greenberg (1989a) suggests that, as the individual engages in illegal behaviour over a period of time, the reaction of the significant others becomes less important.

The effect of peers' participation in delinquency has been found to be related to criminal behaviour (Paternoster, 1986: 155; Warr and Stafford, 1991: 851). Persons with law-abiding friends conform to the law regardless of perceived risk because the criminality might be detected by disapproving peers (Rankin and Wells, 1982). Individuals who report that many of their friends have committed criminal acts are more likely to become involved in them than those individuals with conventional type peers (Paternoster, 1986: 155).

Socio-Economic/Demographic Factors

Applying a rational choice model to juvenile justice encourages the assumption that young people are capable of rationally weighing costs and benefits. Cusson (1983) argues that young people make choices that might be considered rational; however, these choices are based on available opportunities, and may be based on meeting particular goals of the moment. Choices made by youth are different from rational calculations of costs and

benefits based on long term consequences (Doob, Marinos, and Varma, 1995: 65). Consequently, young people are less deterable by threats of formal punishment than are older people (Grasmick and Milligan, 1976; Green, 1989c; Sherman, 1993). As predicted by social control theory, older people generally have more of a stake in conformity, consistent with other findings that sanctions are more effective with in-groups than out-groups (Sherman, 1993: 451).

Social Class

Social class influences the ability of sanctions to deter. Middle class youth may over-estimate the likelihood of apprehension for themselves personally, and conceive punishment as more severe than it really is (Tittle and Logan, 1973). They typically have little personal contact with legal processes and therefore no realistic basis for judgement. In addition, middle class youth have a greater stake in conformity, as they have more to lose than lower class youth (Zimring and Hawkins, 1973; Silberman, 1976). Consequently, middle class youth may be more easily deterred. Lower class youth usually have enough contact with the legal system to know that the likelihood of apprehension and punishment is light and to know that typical punishments are not unbearable (Tittle and Logan, 1973). This indicates that middle class persons are more likely to be deterred through the threat of sanctions than lower class persons.

Employment

Youth (individuals between the ages of 15 to 24) unemployment in Canada in 1993 averaged 15 percent overall (Canadian Youth Foundation, 1995). While it is debatable whether delinquency precedes or follows unemployment (Hagan, 1993), according to control theory, periods of high unemployment or recession lead to the commission of more crime as a result of weakening of social bonds (Box, 1987: 44). Unemployment weakens and often destroys family relationships, resulting in decreasing attachment to significant others. The absence of future employment alienates youth from the job market, thereby decreasing commitment to conventional society and beliefs in the legitimacy of conformity to

conventional rules and norms and resulting in motivation to deviate. Box (1987: 45) claims that during periods of recession, lower class youth with weak social bonds are more likely to deviate not because their social bonds are weaker, as middle class youth may have weak social bonds also, but because the combination of weakened social bonds and a motivation to deviate is stronger. Consequently, during a recession, those not tied to the conventional order by informal bonds, those marginalized from the institutionalized organisations for social change, and those alienated from the forces of law and order are likely to have the largest and the fastest-growing rate of conventional crimes (Box, 1987: 48).

Hartnagel's (1990) longitudinal study of unemployment and crime demonstrated that the effect of unemployment on crime is limited to the more criminally disposed youth, suggesting an interaction between prior criminality and length of unemployment, resulting in later criminal behaviour. Thus, those youths involved in criminal behaviour during their final year of high school, that is more criminally disposed youth, demonstrated a net effect of length of unemployment on property crime.

Deterrence during periods of recession becomes increasingly difficult, as those unemployed, with prior criminality included, have stronger motivation to commit criminal acts. The potential rewards of crime outweigh the risks and costs associated with punishment, as the unemployed have less stake in conformity and commitment to society. Justification of formal sanctions as a deterrent becomes problematic when one considers that the unemployed are more likely to be arrested and referred to court than the employed when in contact with police (Box, 1987: 168). There is also some evidence to support the notion that judges tend to sentence unemployed persons to incarceration more often than employed persons (Box, 1987: 175; Hartnagel, 1990: 3-4).

Limitations of the Literature

According to Jensen et al. (1978: 59), sociology has been characterized as the 'science of sophomores,' as sociological research is often limited to university undergraduate samples. Not surprisingly, deterrence research suffers from a dearth of evidence about known offenders (Decker, Wright and Logie, 1993: 135). In general, the

NOTE TO USERS

Page(s) not included in the original manuscript are unavailable from the author or university. The manuscript was microfilmed as received.

24

This reproduction is the best copy available

UMI

peer behaviour, moral beliefs, and social disapproval serve to inhibit illegal behaviour, through the threat of shame and embarrassment (Paternoster and Iovanni, 1996). These claims, indicating that informal sources of social control have a greater effect in deterring than formal sources, require further investigation.

In addition, socio-economic and demographic factors influence the effectiveness of strict discipline as a deterrent. Young people are generally less deterrable than adults, as they have less of a stake in conformity (Sherman, 1993). Similarly, those from a higher social class may be easier to deter, as they may have a greater stake in conformity (Zimring and Hawkins, 1973). Employment status also indicates the importance of the social bond, as unemployed youth may have less commitment to conformity (Box, 1987). These factors were taken into consideration in the design of the interview schedule.

Chapter Notes

1. See Gibbs, 1968; Tittle, 1969; Logan, 1972; Bailey and Smith, 1972; Erickson and Gibbs, 1973; Bailey, 1976; Geerken and Gove, 1977; Bailey, 1980; Zimring, 1981; Decker and Kohfeld, 1985; Shore and Maguin, 1988; Singer and McDowall, 1988; and Jensen and Metsger, 1994.
2. See Tittle, 1969; Logan, 1972; Waldo and Chiricos, 1972; Tittle and Rowe, 1973; Kraut, 1976; Silberman, 1976; Teevan, 1976a, 1976b; Anderson, Chiricos, and Waldo, 1977; Jensen, Erickson, and Gibbs, 1978.
3. See Tittle, 1977; Grasmick and Bryjak, 1980; Grasmick and Green, 1980; Scott and Grasmick, 1981; Anderson, Harris, and Miller, 1983; Grasmick, Jacobs, and McCollom, 1983; Green, 1989a; Green, 1989b; Grasmick and Bursik, 1990; Grasmick, Bursik, and Cochran, 1991; Grasmick, Bursik, and Arneklev, 1993; Blackwell, Grasmick, and Cochran, 1994; and Petee, Milner, and Welch, 1994.
4. See Waldo and Chiricos, 1972; Tittle and Rowe, 1973; Kraut, 1976; Silberman, 1976; Teevan, 1976a; Anderson, Chiricos, and Waldo, 1977; Williams and Gibbs, 1981; Gray, Miranne, Ward, and Menke, 1982; Minor and Harry, 1982; Paternoster, Saltzman, Chiricos, and Waldo, 1982; Saltzman, Paternoster, Waldo, and Chiricos, 1982; Paternoster, Saltzman, Waldo, and Chiricos, 1983; Paternoster, Saltzman, Waldo, and Chiricos, 1985; Miranne and Gray, 1987; Howe and Brandau, 1988; Lanza-Kaduce, 1988; and Gertz and Gould, 1995.
5. See Teevan, 1976b; Jensen, Erickson and Gibbs, 1978; Klemke, 1978; Rankin and Wells, 1982; Bishop, 1984; Pestello, 1984; Thomas and Bishop, 1984; Paternoster, 1986;

Paternoster and Iovanni, 1986; Paternoster, 1988; Paternoster, 1989a; Paternoster, 1989b; Keane, Gillis, and Hagan, 1989; Nagin and Paternoster, 1991; Warr and Stafford, 1991; and Burkett and Ward, 1993.

6. See Selke, 1983; Sherman and Berk, 1985; McClelland and Alpert, 1985; Bridges and Stone, 1986; Piliavin, Gartner, Thornton, and Matsueda, 1986; Sherman, Schmidt, Rogan, Gartin, Cohn, Collins, and Bacich, 1991; Horney and Marshall, 1992; Pate and Hamilton, 1992; Decker, Wright and Logie, 1993; Apospori and Alpert, 1993; and Yu, 1994.

7. See Claster, 1967; Glassner, Ksander, and Berg, 1983; Rausch, 1983; Schneider and Ervin, 1990; Ladouceur and Biron, 1993; Thornberry et al., 1994.

Chapter 3.

Methodology

*'As a methodologist, the fundamental question of methods is a simple one:
Why should anyone (not originally disposed to) believe your claims?'*

(Goldenberg, 1992: 18).

Research Design

This qualitative evaluation was conducted at two open custody ten-bed facilities in Essex County for Phase II male young offenders. Phase II young offenders include those youth over the age of sixteen, under the mandate of the provincial Ministry of the Solicitor General and Correctional Services. Permission to access the facility and conduct the interviews was obtained from the Executive Director of the agency (See Appendix 1). Convenience sampling, a non-probability sampling technique, was used to select the sample, which consisted of twenty Phase II male young offenders, aged sixteen and seventeen years, in residence at the facilities during the period of December 1997 to March 1998.

Most interviews were held at one residence where all residents were schooled during the day. Only one interview was conducted at the second residence, in the evening, as the resident was schooled at an outside facility. The order of the interviews was selected in co-operation with the facility's staff, in order to minimize disruption to the students' school work, and to interview residents based upon their schedule for release.

Prior to the first interview, the Executive Director introduced the researcher to the residents during the in-house school, and provided an overview of the purpose of the research. It was emphasized that the interview was completely voluntary. As a steady turnover rate of residents exists, not all of the residents interviewed were present for the initial introduction. However, all residents received a consistent introduction prior to commencing each interview.

Prior to each interview, the researcher provided a brief overview of the research project. It was explained that the research was being conducted in fulfilment of degree requirements at the University of Windsor. It was emphasized that the research was not connected to the facility or staff, and that the staff would not have access to the information discussed in the interview. It was explained that the interview was confidential, and that any information discussed in the interview would not be used in a manner that would identify the youth in the final report. It was stressed that the interview was voluntary, and that the resident did not have to feel obligated to participate. The participant was informed that he could refuse to answer any questions that he did not want to answer, and that he could withdraw from the study at any time. The participant was informed that the researcher wished to record the interview for the purpose of transcription. The participant was informed that the interview would only be taped with their permission, and that the tape would be erased following the transcription. The participant was informed that after signing the informed consent form, he would receive a coupon worth \$10.00. It was stated that after signing the informed consent form, the resident would keep the coupon, regardless of whether or not the interview was actually completed.

In order to minimize discomfort for any youth who were not able to read, the researcher always asked if the resident would like the informed consent form read out loud. The informed consent form was approved by the Department of Sociology and Anthropology Ethics Committee (See Appendix 2). After reading the informed consent form, the participant signed the form and was given a coupon for participating. All participants signed an informed consent form.

After signing the consent form, and prior to commencing the interview, the

participant was asked for permission to tape record the interview. All requested residents agreed to participate, and to allow the interview to be taped. Each interview was randomly assigned an interview number. The interview schedule (See Appendix 3) was adhered to, in order to allow a semi-structured dialogue. The actual interview schedule was also used to record handwritten notes, taken during the interview. Most interviews were approximately one half hour to forty-five minutes in duration. Interviews were held in a private board room or office, both for convenience and confidentiality.

As soon as possible following the interview, the recorded tapes were transcribed. Transcriptions were typed into an interview schedule template, and saved under the filename of the interview number. Any reflections after the completion of the interview were noted.

Data Analysis

The interview schedule was saved as a WordPerfect template document in the subdirectory <c:\data\research>. The printed interview schedule was used during the interview to record handwritten notes on the schedule. The interview schedule was transcribed onto the template <c:\data\research\int_sche.wpt>. Each transcribed document was saved as <c:\data\research\int*.wpd>, where * represented the randomly assigned interview number. The interview schedule was transcribed in whole by the researcher, as soon as possible following the interview. Each interview transcription was saved as a separate WordPerfect file.

The first step of the data analysis involved compiling responses to the questions posed in the interview schedule. Each question was coded, and the extracted answers were compiled from each interview transcription. While the interview schedule had been designed with questions relating to the concepts rising out of the literature review, the data was also coded according to particular themes that emerged. The fluidity of the interviews often resulted in a participant later detailing information relevant to an earlier theme or question.

The coding process can be understood in terms of decontextualization and recontextualization (Tesch, 1990). Decontextualizing data involves segmenting portions of

data and slicing up the data set. In doing so, data extracts were separated from their original context, while retaining their meaning. The following categories or concepts were conceptually coded: school, employment, significant others, substance abuse, socioeconomic status, criminal history, custodial history, attachment, involvement, commitment, belief, certainty, severity, celerity, shame, embarrassment, and defiance. Coded concepts were extracted and merged with other interview data. Again, information extracted was identified by the interview number, with the original interview document remaining intact.

Tesch (1990) suggests that segmented data are recontextualized, providing a new context for viewing and analysing the data. The recontextualization of the data repositioned the information in relation to the theoretical constructs. The data summary was analysed in terms of deterrence and social control. For example, those who are employed may be considered 'more deterrable,' as they have a higher stake in conformity.

The final step of the data analysis was to reflect upon the analysis. Kirby and McKenna (1989) suggest that the researcher rework the analysis following a period of detachment from the process. A period of time away from the analysis allowed for a reflective period, critical in order to allow the researcher to see the overall pattern of the research, and to make adjustments on the final analysis.

Reliability and Validity

Reliability and validity issues were considered in order to ensure the accuracy of the study. Reliability refers to the extent to which a measurement procedure yields the same results however, and whenever, it is carried out (Kirk and Miller, 1986: 19). Validity refers to the extent to which a measurement gives the correct answer. Internal validity refers to the ability to eliminate alternative explanations of the dependent variable (Neuman, 1991).

Reliability

Reliability refers to consistency or repeatability (Goldenberg, 1992: 109). A reliable measurement should produce the same results regardless of who uses it, as long as it is used properly. The interview schedule was developed based on the literature review. Previously

constructed interview schedules and survey instruments have been used and adapted in order to maximize reliability (Paternoster, 1989; Bridges and Stone, 1986; Nagin and Paternoster, 1991; and Paternoster and Iovanni, 1986).

Internal Validity

Internal validity refers to the accuracy of a study within its own context or parameters (Goldenberg, 1992: 94). Kirk and Miller (1986: 21) describe validity as a question of whether the researcher sees what one thinks one sees. According to Neuman (1991), an examination of internal validity requires that common threats to validity be ruled out, in order to control experimental conditions. Neuman (1991) identifies several factors which may threaten internal validity.

Neuman (1991) suggests that instrumentation effects may occur if the instrument or measure changes during the experiment. Therefore, the interview schedule used to collect data remained consistent throughout the research. The researcher also presented a standard introduction and overview of the interview to all participants.

In addition, Neuman (1991) indicated that attrition affects the internal validity of the research. All participants contacted by the researcher agreed to the interview, and no participants withdrew after the interview was initiated.

Neuman (1991) also identified experimenter expectancy as a threat to internal validity, as the experimenter's behaviour can indirectly communicate the research hypothesis to subjects. This threat was minimized as there was only one researcher carrying out the data collection. This examination was an exploratory study, in which the researcher attempted to uncover thoughts and perceptions, rather than extracting answers in a leading fashion. This threat was minimized through the use of a reflective listening technique. After asking the question on the interview schedule, the researcher attempted to reflect the answer provided by the participant, which in turn typically led to further clarification and reinforcement of the initial response by the participant. Occasionally, the clarification negated the original response, in which case the secondary response was used in the data analysis.

External Validity

External validity refers to the generalizability of the findings of the study under review (Goldenberg, 1992: 96). As a non-probability sampling method will be used, the sample may not be generalizable to the population at whole. However, the intent of qualitative research is not to generalize findings, but to form a unique interpretation of events (Creswell, 1994: 159). The intent of this research is not to provide a quantitative analysis generalizable to the young offender population; rather, this research will attempt to provide an exploratory evaluation, from the perspective of the young offender, the deterrent effects of the threat of punishment. It is anticipated that this data will be of value in program assessment. While not intended to be generalizable, the issues facing residents of open custody are likely to be of a similar nature. Perspectives on crime and punishment vocalized by the participants in this research may be of value to other researchers or program evaluators.

Chapter 4.

Findings

'It's just a way to kill time. It's just like the army, they're trying to play with your head. But there's other ways of playing games with the system. I've learned it all, you know [laughs]. To play games with the system. They're trying to, just like wash your mind, like, I don't know what, you can't really do that. Crime's stuck in your head.'

(Participant's response to questioning on what he had heard about the creation of a strict discipline program in Ontario.)

Background

To begin, background information on the sample will be provided. Nine of the participants interviewed were sixteen years old, and eleven of the participants were seventeen years old. The youth interviewed provided a summary of their typical daily activities prior to their incarceration. The majority of activities identified involved various forms of criminal activity and leisure.

When asked to describe a typical day before coming to the open custody facility, fifteen participants responded that they do or buy drugs, and three responded that they sell drugs. Ten participants responded that they drink or get drunk. Six participants indicated that they like to party. Seven participants responded that they engage in criminal activities on a typical day. These activities were interspersed with other non-criminal activities such

as attending school, lifting weights, and listening to music. One participant responded:

A typical day. Getting up in the morning. Sitting around, watching tv for a little bit. Getting a hold of some of my friends. Usually end up going out, and getting drunk or high. Sometimes if I'm not with my friends I'd probably... go out and shoot some pool, go on bike rides, and stuff. Usually in the evening, probably get you know high or something again, and then I'd go home and get in a fight with my mom.

Of the twenty participants, fifteen in total indicated that they liked to either party, get high, or get drunk for fun. Other activities that participants cited as fun ranged from playing sports and/or video games, sitting around, listening to music or watching television, and going out to the movies, restaurants, and clubs. When asked what he liked to do for fun, one participant responded:

I don't know, if we're like bored or something we'll go cause trouble. Other than that, we just sit around. If we got what we need, we don't need to go anywhere.... We go to get what we need. What we need is by causing trouble, to get it.... Drinks, drugs, go do what I have to do to get it. You know what I'm saying.

When asked how they came to be at the open custody facility, participants reported offences ranging from property offences, violent offences, drug offences, mischief, breach of probation, and being unlawfully at large (See Table 1). Most youth were incarcerated for multiple offences. To exemplify, when asked to describe how he came to be at the facility, this participant stated:

Break and enter, three breaches, assault, two AWOLs, theft under, possession under, and two warrants. That's not all my charges though.

Several participants also described extensive criminal records, as indicated by this participant, who summarized:

Car theft, assault, breach of probation, assault, ten break and enters, theft under, theft over, possession under, possession over, possession of break and enter tools, possession of stolen property. I think that's all. Oh, escape custody. I did that three times, escaped three times. And I think that's it.

Table 1 - Self Reported Criminal History

	Number of Times Reported	Percentage of Total
Property Offences*	24	36%
Violent Offences†	15	22%
Drug Offences‡	4	6%
Other§	24	36%
Total	67	100%

* Includes break and enter, attempted break and enter, possession of tools to commit break and enter, theft, car theft, attempted theft, and possession of stolen property.

† Includes uttering death threats, assault, assault with a weapon, possession of a weapon, and armed robbery.

‡ Includes possession of narcotics and trafficking cocaine.

§ Includes mischief, breach of recognizance, and absent without leave.

Prior daily patterns of behaviour and previous criminal activities may suggest that these youth are at risk for the commission of further criminal activities upon release. However, deterrence theory posits that the certainty, severity, and celerity of punishment will affect the offender's decision to commit further offences. In contrast, rather than attempting to prevent criminal behaviour through the threat of punishment, social control theories attempt to explain criminal behaviour by identifying social factors which work to prevent people from committing deviant behaviour. This analysis will examine both formal

and informal deterrence systems. The examination of informal deterrence systems, or social controls that might serve to inhibit criminal behaviour, will include the educational system, employment, familial relationships, peer groups, and moral values and belief systems. The examination of informal deterrence systems will be followed by an analysis of formal deterrence systems, including previous police contact, experience within the court system, custodial experience, knowledge and perceptions of a strict discipline program, certainty of punishment, probability of deterrence, and fairness of punishment.

Informal Social Control

School

The educational system serves as an informal source of control. According to social control theory, successful academic performance, a strong attachment to school, and a concern for how well one does in school should reduce the likelihood of criminal behaviour.

Academic Performance

All twenty of the participants were attending school at the time of the interview. Two participants were attending outside schools, and eighteen were attending the in-house school. However, prior to custody, only eight of the participants had been attending school. Of the twelve participants not attending school, five had been kicked out of school, five had dropped out or quit, and two had not been able to return to school after serving time. Despite the fact that the majority of participants had not been attending school prior to their incarceration, only two participants stated that they did not intend to return to their community-based school upon their release from custody.

According to Hirschi (1969), the better a student does in school, the less likely he is to commit delinquent acts, and the less likely he is to be picked up by the police. Hirschi does not assume that a lack of intelligence causes delinquency by the underestimation of the risk of detection. Rather, Hirschi suggests that in a system where academic competence is rewarded, while incompetence is punished, the cost of detection is assumed to be reduced

for those who perform poorly, because their ties to the conventional order have been weakened. While academically incompetent persons may foresee the consequences of their actions, consequences are less serious for those who perform poorly.

As indicated by the high number of youth who had dropped out or had been expelled from school prior to their incarceration, the participants in this study demonstrated Hirschi's described weak academic competence level. Participants expressed difficulty in succeeding at school, as indicated by this participant who stated:

I have a hard time understanding the work I'm doing.

Difficulties in the conventional school system may have served to place these youth at higher risk for the commission of delinquent acts, for which they are now incarcerated.

Participants were also quick to cite numerous distractions which affected their ability to perform well within the conventional school system. The predominant reason cited for being suspended or expelled from school was for inappropriate or violent behaviour. One participant, who indicated that he had been out of school two years prior to his incarceration, explained that he had been 'kicked out of school' due to his behavioural problems:

Getting into verbal arguments with my principals and teachers, getting into fights at school and stuff.

Participants also indicated that alcohol and drugs impaired their ability to function within the conventional school system. This participant described alcohol and drug abuse on an average day:

Wake up, smoke some weed, go to school, drink, smoke weed, sit in class, don't listen, tell the teacher to fuck off, I don't want to do this work, 90% of the time I just go to school, go to a friend's house, drink, just drink all day, go home, go to bed, go and get bitched at, and then to go bed.

Another participant described his experience within the educational system:

School is where I smoked a lot of weed. I went to school, I never started smoking weed, then I went to high school, started hanging out with those fucking drug dealers, then I was smoking like thirty joints a day. Turning green in class, from smoking too much weed, it ain't good. Then I got caught smoking weed, I got suspended. Happy days are over now. Sitting in jail.

It is important to note that all participants were attending school at the time of the interview; however, all but two of the participants were attending the in-house school. The in-house school, operated by two accredited teachers, provides Ministry of Education and Training curricula and courses, and is significantly different from a community-based school. Attendance is mandatory at the in-house school for all residents sentenced to thirty days or more, unless they are granted permission to attend a community-based school. Residents sentenced to less than thirty days are required to participate in a life skills program. Residents must demonstrate good behaviour in the classroom in order to be granted extra in-house privileges, which provides a strong motivation for the youth to do well in the classroom.

The in-house school works on a system of continuous intake, with each student working in different subjects, at different grade levels, and on different academic levels. Students work on Independent Learning Courses (ILC), which are correspondence courses provided by the Ministry of Education and Training. Students attempt to achieve one credit at a time, with the average student taking approximately one month to complete a course. Factors such as mandatory attendance, lower student/teacher ratios, individualized course work, the single course focus, and fewer distractions (altercations with other students, drugs, alcohol) have all contributed to the increased level of successful completion of courses while attending the in-house school. One participant indicated:

Here, like I've been getting like high 80's and low 90's in all my classes, so. And, well, when I was in school outside of being in custody, I was always

getting low marks and stuff. It makes me look at it and just think, just kind of like wow, you know, I'm actually getting something done and doing good at it, so. And I always tell my mom, and she's always proud of me for it.

While it was reported by several participants that their academic achievement was much higher while attending the in-house school, their teachers reported that the grades received in-house were comparable to the grades received while attending a community-based school. However, the teachers did report that transcripts indicated that some custodial facilities do tend to assign inflated grades to the residents, when compared to their grades received while attending community based schools. When asked, the teachers reported that it was difficult to compare grades, as school attendance is mandatory at the in-house school, and the community-based grades often reflect poor attendance. However, the lack of distractions at the in-house school, including conflicts with other students and substance abuse, appears to contribute to an increase in the academic performance of the participants while residing at the House, as evidenced by the successful completion of course work.

These indications of an increased level of academic performance suggest that criminal behaviour, upon release, will be reduced. However, continued successful academic performance may be contingent upon the quality of education provided once immersed into the community-based school upon release. If they return to a community based school, complete with distractions already cited, it is unlikely that criminal behaviour will be reduced. In fact, the availability of illegal substances, including drugs and alcohol, in all likelihood, will result in continued criminal behaviour upon their release.

Attachment to School

Respondents were asked if they liked school. Eight participants indicated that they did like school; however, these participants were not overwhelmingly enthusiastic, as indicated by a 'yeah' or 'school is okay' type of answer. Twelve participants indicated that they did not like going to school. When asked why they did not like going to school, most respondents noted that school is boring, too hard, or too stressful. This participant responded:

It's boring. I just go because I want to finish school.

Regardless of whether they liked school or not, respondents demonstrated an understanding that education is required in order to get a job. This attitude was exemplified by the following participant:

I don't mind it that much.... Cause you need school, have to get an education, you know, to work and stuff.

Another participant responded:

Ah yeah, well I changed my outlook on it, when I was in here. Understand that I need to get a job.... I realized that I don't like it, I'm not going to like it, but I need it.

In general, the participants did not indicate a strong attachment to school. Poor academic performance in the past and negative experiences within the educational system seem to have contributed to a general dislike toward school. This weak attachment to school may serve to negate the influence of academic performance.

Care About How Well They Do in School

When asked if they care about how well they do in school, fifteen participants responded that they do care about how well they do in school. Most participants indicated that they wanted to be able to graduate and find employment. For example, this participant indicated that he cared about how well he did in school, and why:

Graduate and be somebody some day. Get a real job.

Several participants indicated that they hoped to go to college after graduating from high school. When asked if he cared about how well he did in school, this participant responded:

Yes. I want to do good so I can go to college eventually.

Three participants indicated that they had not cared about how well they did before, when they were in high school, but now that they are at the facility they do care. This participant indicated:

Not then, but I do now. Cause I'm almost seventeen years old and I can't do nothing. I don't know, I don't know a lot of the stuff, I don't know some of the stuff that I should know.

Only four participants responded that they did not care how well they do in school. When asked if he cared about how well he did in school, this participant responded:

Not really, as long as I pass.

Theoretically, with successful academic performance, a strong attachment to school, and concern for how well they do in school, delinquency should be reduced upon release from incarceration. However, this research indicates that the participants' attachment to school is relatively weak. This low level of attachment to school may be countered by the participants' recent level of success in academic performance, along with their concern for doing well in school. Thus, it could be argued that the participants have strengthened their ties to the educational system, as structured in a custodial facility, which may result in a reduction of delinquency upon release.

However, the realities of the conventional school system will also influence behaviour upon release. Given the disparity between the in-house school and a community-based school, it is possible that these youth, upon release, may experience the same difficulties — both in terms of academic performance and attachment — encountered earlier in the conventional school system. Without an adequate system of follow-up with the youth upon release, any gains earned while in custody may be negated by the reality once again experienced within the community-based school system. This suggests that the long-term

influence of the in-house school may be tenuous, and that future delinquency is possible.

Employment

In addition to the influence of the educational system, employment also serves as a source of informal social control. Research finds that those employed, or likely to be employed, are at lower risk for future criminal behaviour, as their stake in conformity is higher.

History of Employment

Eighteen of the participants did not have a job at the time of the interview. One respondent reported that he drove a fork lift at a factory. One respondent reported that he picked up scrap metal when he needed money. These numbers are not surprising since the emphasis for youth while in residence is on completing schoolwork rather than searching for a job.

However, thirteen respondents indicated that they had held jobs prior to coming to the facility. As indicated in Table 2, these jobs ranged from fast food to construction and factory work. One participant described his employment history:

Q - Were you working before?

A - Yeah.

Q - Doing what?

A - Roofs, tear offs, clean up.

Q - How long were you working there?

A - Just part-time, under the table.

Q - Had you worked anywhere else?

A - Dickie Dee Ice Cream, that's it.

The majority of participants reported having held previous employment. Sixteen year old participants were more likely than the seventeen year old participants to report

Table 2 - Previous Employment Cited

	# of Times Cited	% of Total
Autobody	1	4.5%
Construction	6	27%
Factory Labour	1	4.5%
Farming	7	32%
Food Services	3	14%
Janitorial Services	2	9%
Sales	2	9%
Total	22	100%

having no history of previous employment. In addition, the data was coded in order to analyse the participants' previous school enrollment and history of employment (See Table 3). As indicated by the data, seven of the eight participants who reported that they had been attending school prior to their incarceration also reported a history of some form of previous employment. In contrast, of the twelve participants who were not attending school prior to their incarceration, half reported no history of employment. This suggests that people with commitment to one type of institution are more likely to have commitment to others. If these youth fail to return to school upon their release, and remain unemployed, their lack of a stake in conformity increases the likelihood of future offending.

Attachment to Employment

When asked if they liked their job, eleven of the thirteen previously employed participants responded that they had liked at least one of their past jobs. While the majority of participants were not overwhelmingly enthusiastic, six of these participants indicated that they liked the money received from working, and eight of these participants indicated that they had wanted to work. This participant responded that he enjoyed the financial benefits

of employment:

I wanted to work there. I wanted to get money.

Table 3 - School Attendance and Previous Work Experience

	No previous work experience	Previous work experience	Total
Attending school prior to incarceration	1 (5%)	7 (35%)	8 (40%)
Not attending school prior to incarceration	6 (30%)	6 (30%)	12 (60%)
Total	7 (35%)	13 (65%)	20 (100%)

Another participant described his employment history as follows:

Q - Did you have a job before you came here?

A - Yeah.

Q - What did you do?

A - Corn detassel.

Q - How long have you detasselled?

A - Oh, the season just started three weeks before I went to jail....

Q - What kind of other jobs have you done?

A - Roofing, picking strawberries.

Q - Did you like working at these jobs?

A - I liked roofing. Not the others, they're hard.

Q - Harder than roofing?

A - Well, roofing's hard, but I know I'll get the benefit out of it.

Q - Did you want to work roofing or were you just kind of putting in time?

A - Well, I wanted to work, but that was one of the only places I could work.

Only two of the previously employed participants responded that they did not like their jobs. One participant indicated:

Q - When you were working in [name of city] what did you do?

A - Worked on a farm.

Q - And is that the only job that you've done before?

A - Yeah.

Q - Did you like it?

A - No.

Q - Why not?

A - Uh, I didn't like working in the fields and stuff.

Most participants indicated that they had liked their past jobs, and wanted to work. The primary reason provided was that participants enjoyed the financial benefits of employment. It is possible that this attachment to employment indicates a commitment to conventional society that might carry over when these youth are released. However, the small number of participants who indicated that they had not wanted to work indicates a detachment from the labour market that leaves them at greater risk for future criminal behaviour. As previously indicated, most participants did not report a desire to find employment immediately upon release. Rather, participants anticipated returning to school for further training, and discussed their preferred future employment.

Preferred Employment

When asked what kind of job they would like to have, the responses were diverse (See Table 4). Jobs cited varied from professional occupations (veterinarian, fireman, engineering, nursing, pilot), white collar occupations (presentations/travel), skilled blue collar occupations (tool and die, mold maker, auto-mechanics, professional athlete), to unskilled blue collar occupations (sales, construction, services). This participant responded:

Q - What kind of job would you like to have?

A - Uh man, I don't know, something like maybe like a fireman, or like, something like that.

Q - How come?

A - I don't know, I've always had a thing with fire. Just seems to be a fun job.

Table 4 - Preferred Employment of Participants

	# of Times Cited	% of Total
Professional	6	30%
White Collar	1	5%
Blue Collar (Skilled)	6	30%
Blue Collar (Unskilled)	6	30%
Don't Know	1	5%
Total	20	100%

Another respondent indicated:

Q - What kind of job would you like to have, if you could do whatever you want?

A - Um, something where I could travel, travel around the world.

Q - In what field, do you know?

A - I don't know, something not too hard, like giving presentations or something, going to conventions.

Strain theorists suggest that unattainable goals may result in frustration, providing motivation for people to commit criminal acts. While it could be argued that the preferred employment goals cited by these youth may be unrealistic, and could lead to strain, it is important to note that participants clearly had not spent a lot of time thinking about their future. Most participants were slow to answer this question, and appeared to acknowledge

that these preferred occupations were not necessarily their future jobs, especially as described within the context of their future aspirations.

Future Aspirations

When asked what they thought they would be doing in the future, participants reported that they hoped to be living a conventional lifestyle, both in the short term (one year), and the long term (five years). When asked what they thought that they would be doing in one year, sixteen participants volunteered that they would probably be working. Twelve participants indicated that they would probably still be in school, and six participants indicated that they might be done school by that time. Four participants volunteered that they would probably be staying out of trouble. Two participants indicated that they might be living with a girlfriend and settling down. Two participants indicated that they might have a child, and one stated that he would be taking care of his child. Two respondents indicated that they hoped to have a car, and one indicated that he hoped to have his own house or apartment. Several participants predicted that they would be breeding pitbulls a year from now. One participant replied:

One year? I'll probably be working, when I get out of here I'm planning on finding a job again. I probably, I might still be in school, but I doubt it. I'll probably have graduated school.

Another participant replied:

Hopefully working, have a good job, have a good car, going to school I guess, or finished school.

Participants responded in a similar manner when asked what they thought that they would be doing in five years' time. Thirteen participants indicated that they would probably be working, and ten participants indicated that they would probably be living on their own or in their own house. Six respondents predicted that they would be settled down with a

girlfriend or married, and four participants indicated that they might have a family. Four participants predicted that they would have children. Five respondents indicated that they would probably be done school, and four participants suggested that they might be in college in five years. Five youth indicated that they would probably be staying out of trouble. Three participants indicated that they hoped to have a car. One participant stated:

Q - What do you think you'll be doing in five years' time?

A - Five years? I don't know, I'll probably have a better job, a nice car, I don't know, maybe have my own house somewhere.

Q - What kind of job?

A - I don't know, something that pays pretty good. Maybe be living up north, cause I like it up there. I wouldn't be causing any more crap, cause I don't want to go through it all the time or anything like that.

Q - Think you're going to stay out of trouble?

A - Uh huh, maybe have a wife or a fiancé or something. I don't have a clue what else I'll be doing.

Another participant replied:

Five years time? It's hard to say, I'm not thinking about five years from now. I'm just thinking about one day at a time. Like I hope, I hope that I'm not doing crime, maybe a family or something. Maybe be in a good relationship, have a good relationship with a girl, hopefully have a good paying job, maybe own my own house, something.... I want to try to get my criminal record cleared. Somebody was saying, somebody told me that after five years that you can go and get your record, like your police record cleared.

Despite the fact that these youth are currently incarcerated, the majority of participants indicated that they would be living a conventional lifestyle in the near future. It was clear from the responses that a large number of these youth had not previously considered what kind of job they would like to have in the future. However, when asked to consider it, the majority of participants cited employment that would require a relatively high level of education or training. Despite the fact that the majority of these youth had previous

experience working in unskilled blue collar jobs (See Table 2), 65% of the participants cited preferred employment that consisted of professional, white collar, or skilled blue collar jobs (See Table 4).

To summarize employment, social control theory predicts that those more strongly attached to employment are less likely to commit criminal behaviour, as their stake in conformity is higher. While these participants were not currently employed, it is not significant, as House residents are required to attend school. In general, most participants responded that they had been employed in the past, and that they liked being employed, primarily because of the money earned. In addition, participants indicated their preferred future employment, with definite plans for the future. We might speculate that those participants demonstrating an attachment to the labour market are less likely to reoffend upon release. In contrast, those participants who reported no previous employment experiences, those who indicated that they did not like previous employment, or those who indicated an unrealistic expectation of employment opportunities may be more likely to reoffend upon release.

Attachment to Significant Others

Social control theory posits that a strong attachment to non-deviant significant others, including parents, friends, and role models, increases adherence to conventional norms and values, thereby decreasing the likelihood of deviance. This part of the analysis will examine the impact of familial relationships, followed by an examination of the influence of peer interaction and peer behaviour.

Familial Relationships

The participants' residential history prior to incarceration was examined. Of the twenty participants, only two indicated that they had lived with both their natural mother and father prior to coming to the facility. Five participants indicated that one of their parents had died, and one participant indicated that both of his parents had died. Two participants responded that their fathers were in jail. The remaining participants' parents were either

separated, divorced or never married. Eight participants also indicated the presence of blended families, including parents who remarried, along with step-siblings.

Before coming to the facility, two participants were living with both parents, eight participants were living with their mother, two participants were living with their father, two participants were living with their sister, three participants were living with friends, three participants were living on their own, and one participant was living in a group home (See Table 5). While thirteen of the participants were living with a member of their immediate

Table 5 - Participant's Residential History Prior to Custody

	Natural Mother	Natural Father
Living with Both Parents	2 (10%)	2 (10%)
Living with Parent	8 (40%)	2 (10%)
Not Living with Parent	8 (40%)	9 (45%)
Parent Incarcerated	0 (0%)	2 (10%)
Parent Not Living	2 (10%)	5 (25%)
Total	20 (100%)	20 (100%)

family, eight participants indicated that their living arrangements had fluctuated from one family member to another, and friends over a period of time.

Sixteen participants had been in contact with their mother since coming to the facility. Only five participants had been in contact with their fathers since coming to the facility.

Parental Employment

Nine participants' mothers were employed (See Table 6). The following jobs were cited: factory work (3), sales, legal secretary, self-employed (2), and registered nurse. One participant reported that he thought that his mother was a judge. Six participants indicated

Table 6 - Parental Employment

	Mother	Father
Professional	1 (5%)	0 (0%)
Blue Collar (Skilled)	2 (10%)	1 (5%)
Blue Collar (Unskilled)	4 (20%)	5 (25%)
Self-employed	2 (10%)	1 (5%)
Unemployed	1 (5%)	0 (0%)
Disability	1 (5%)	0 (0%)
Social Services	4 (20%)	2 (10%)
Incarcerated	0 (0%)	2 (10%)
Not Living	2 (10%)	5 (25%)
No Answer	3 (15%)	4 (20%)
Total	20 (100%)	20 (100%)

that their mothers did not work. Four of these reported that their mothers collected social service benefits or Mothers' Allowance, and one indicated that his mother collected disability benefits. One participant did not know whether his mother worked or not, and two participants did not know where their mothers worked.

Nine participants' fathers were employed (See Table 6). While two participants did not know where their father worked, the following jobs were cited: factory work (3), bartending, crane operator, mold maker, and self-employed. Two fathers collected social service benefits, and two fathers were incarcerated.

Participants were also categorized by both their mothers' and fathers' employment history (See Table 7). To sum, 40% of the participants indicated that both parents worked in an unskilled blue collar job or that one parent worked in an unskilled blue collar job and the other was unemployed, not living, jailed, or the participant did not know where the other

parent worked. A large number, 45% of participants, indicated that both parents were either unemployed, not living, jailed, or the participant did not know where (or if) the parent worked.

Table 7 - Combined Parental Employment

	# of Times Cited	% of Total
One Parent Professional, and One Parent Unemployed/Not Living/Jailed/or Doesn't know	1	5%
Both Parents Blue Collar Skilled	1	5%
One Parent Blue Collar Skilled, and One Parent Unemployed/Not Living/Jailed/or Doesn't know	1	5%
Both Parents Blue Collar Unskilled	4	20%
One Parent Blue Collar Unskilled, and One Parent Unemployed/Not Living/Jailed/or Doesn't know	4	20%
Both Parents Unemployed/Not Living/Jailed/or Doesn't know	9	45%
Total	20	100%

Family Relations

Participants were asked if they got along with their parents when they lived at home. Twelve replied that for the most part, they did get along with the person they were living with. This participant's response was typical:

Yeah, I always got along with my mom, just sometimes like I got in a couple arguments and stuff, but nothing big.

One participant responded:

Q - Did you get along with your parents when you were living with them?

A - Yup. Well sometimes. There's always disagreements in a family though.

Q - What kind of disagreements?

A - Just stupid things like dishes, what time I have to be in at night time, stuff like that, just, coming in drunk.

Eight participants reported that they did not get along with the person that they were living with. This participant explained why he did not get along with his mother:

Because we both have bad tempers. We fly off the handle at each other.

Another participant tried to explain the discord:

Q - Did you get along with your mom when you were living with her?

A - No.

Q - Why not?

A - Behaviour again, I was into drugs and stuff like that.

Q - And stuff like that?

A - Yeah, you know like drinking and partying all the time.

Q - How did she feel about that?

A - Well, she felt obviously that it was wrong, well, I knew it was wrong, but my attitude was kind of like that I was going to do what I wanted, whether or not she liked it.

When asked to describe their relationship with their parents, thirteen identified having a relatively good relationship with their mother (See Table 8). One participant described his relationship with his mother:

Great. We get along great. Like, she knows everything about me now. Got an open relationship.

Table 8 - Quality of Relationship with Parents

	Mother	Father
Good Relationship	13 (65%)	7 (35%)
Not a Good Relationship	3 (15%)	3 (15%)
No Relationship	2 (10%)	5 (25%)
Parent Not Living	2 (10%)	5 (25%)
Total	20 (100%)	20 (100%)

Another participant responded:

With my mom, it's a good relationship. We get along pretty good.

Only three participants replied that their relationship with their mom was not good, and two others indicated that they have no relationship with their mother. This participant described his relationship with his mother:

My mom, it's not so good, because we argue sometimes.

In contrast, when asked to describe their relationship with their father, only seven identified having a good relationship (See Table 8). This participant indicated that his relationship with his dad was good, although contact with his father is limited:

I only see my dad like once a year, but when I see him, it's good.

Three participants indicated that they did not have a good relationship with their father, and five respondents indicated that they have no relationship with their dad. This participant

described his relationship with his father:

With my dad, I don't know. We have a kind of rocky relationship.... We just don't get along real well anymore. Cause I want to do what I want to do, he wants me to do what he wants.

Another participant described his relationship with his father as not good, saying:

I don't want nothing to do with him.

For the most part, the majority of respondents indicated that they had gotten along with the person that they were living with prior to their incarceration, indicating an attachment. Those who indicated that they did not get along with their parents often identified an improvement in the relationship after moving out of the family home. Participants were also more likely to indicate that they got along with their mother than with their father.

The future behaviour of participants is more likely to be affected by those parents they report being strongly attached to, as demonstrated by the participant who considered his mother to be his 'best friend.' The youth's perception of the parent's attitude toward criminal activity must also be considered.

Significant Others' Feelings Toward Criminal Activity

When asked if their parents care that they had broken the law, the only exception was one youth who had no contact with his parents and did not wish to speak about them. All nineteen other participants responded that their family cared that they had broken the law. The majority of youth identified that their mother encouraged them to stay out of trouble. Participants were less likely to acknowledge that their father cared about their law breaking behaviour. When asked if his parents care that he had broken the law, one participant stated:

My dad not as much. But my mom cares a lot. She just worries. She doesn't

want me to end up like, just a nobody, she wants me to have a job when I'm older and get back in school.

This participant responded:

My dad, he doesn't [care], because you know, he's told me before, you know, 'Stop,' and he just keeps telling me, 'Hey, if you do it, well that's your problem, suffer the consequences.' But my mom does, she doesn't want me doing it, she don't want to see me in jail. And my dad, he's been big time in trouble with the cops.... He's spent like half of his life in jail, in the pens.... Whole bunch of stuff. Assaults, attempted murder. Anything.

Another participant described his mother's feelings toward his criminal activities:

Yeah. She's mad at me, but what can she do, I'm a teenager. I'm living a life, you know. She can't stop me. She's tried, believe me.

One participant, whose mother had died and father was in jail, stated:

Yeah, actually they do care. Like my family that I've got, like my two brothers and my sister they do. They don't want me to do it.... They yell at me a lot, give me lectures, tell me not to do it, tell me to go down the right path, not to follow in their footsteps, cause one of my brothers, he's been in trouble with the law a lot too.... Told me not to follow in his footsteps, you know, to do something with your life, be somebody. He always says, 'You know, you've got a kid now, you've got to settle down.'

Participants were also asked to identify other people who may care about them and what they do. Participants identified siblings, grandparents, aunts and uncles, cousins, step-parents, friends, ex-girlfriends, and girlfriends as other people who care about them and what they do. The majority of these participants indicated that their significant others did care that they had broken the law. One participant described his family's reaction to his law breaking behaviour:

My little cousin, she cried over the phone and told me that what I was doing was bad and stuff. When I was in jail and stuff. And my grandma, she just, I don't know. I don't know. I always find it hard to talk to my grandma and I keep crying, cause I can't face her with it and stuff, cause she doesn't like that stuff, she doesn't agree with me doing it and stuff.

Despite the fact that participants indicated that their parents and significant others care about what they do, these youth ended up breaking the law. While participants indicated that their significant others care about what they do, it is evident that a large number of these significant others also indicated tacit or overt approval towards their criminal activity. One participant responded that his family cares about his behaviour, but described receiving conflicting messages:

My brother, two of my brothers are alright with it, like they usually get stuff off me when I steal it, I don't know why they do that but, that kind of puts me into a tough spot, and they usually ask me if I got some stuff, and I'll sell it to them, or give it to them or whatever. Mostly, some of my brothers tell me not to do it, they threaten me, cause I mean they, like they won't do nothing but they say they will.

This participant also declared that his mother cares about his lawbreaking behaviour, but described how he spent money earned from breaking and entering:

Q - Did you give some of that money to your mom?

A - Yeah, help pay rent, put food on the table, buy my sister Christmas presents, whatever we need to buy around the house, I'd get it, if I had the money. Or I'd just, when I got that, when we scored that seventeen grand, I gave my mom seven, eight hundred bucks, plus I paid the rent on top of that.

Q - And did she ask you where the money came from?

A - Yeah.

Q - And what did you tell her?

A - Selling weed.

Q - And what did she say about that?

A - She said, she just, she told me not to get caught. And I didn't.

In addition to the informal or tacit approval of criminal behaviour, respondents also identified knowledge of various family members who had either committed criminal acts or had been incarcerated. Participants cited criminal behaviour and incarceration on the part of their fathers, mothers, brothers, step-fathers, uncles, and friends of their parents. This participant indicated:

Q - Does your mom care that you've broken the law?

A - Yeah, my mom cares.

Q - What does she think or say?

A - Tells me that that's not the right way to go, one of these days I'm going to end up like my dad, gonna be doing time for a long time. Or I'm going to be killed or something.

Q - Did your dad do time?

A - Yeah, he did time 81-86, again from 89-95.

Although participants indicated that their parents and significant others care about what they do, and do not approve of the lawbreaking, the majority of participants indicated that they would decide how they behaved, and that their parents could no longer tell them what to do. This open defiance of their parents' rules often appears to cause sufficient conflict to have resulted in the participant moving out of the parental home, or from one parent's home to the other.

Participants have indicated that certain significant others care about what they do, and do not approve of their lawbreaking; however, respondents have demonstrated that this is not a strong enough deterrent to prevent them from committing criminal acts. According to Hirschi (1969: 108), 'If the child does not care or think about the reaction of his parents, their control over him is seriously reduced.' This participant, who earlier indicated that his brothers buy stolen goods from him, stated:

My mom tells me not to do it, she, she cares about me, she wants me to quit it because she knows I'll just end up coming back here all the time. But I keep doing it.

Another participant described how his father attempted to control his behaviour:

Q - Can you describe a typical day for you?

A - Probably sleep until about noon, then probably go take a shower, do all that, get ready, go out, get drunk or high, that's pretty much it. Just chill with my friends. Stay out till about midnight or whatever, come home, go to sleep.

Q - What did your dad have to say about that?

A - Oh, he didn't like it. At first, when I first moved in with him, it was alright, cause it was like oh well, he was never there, so, what'd he care what I was doing? But then he tried to lay a bunch of rules on me, just more, but it was too late, I was like, I did what I wanted.

Q - So it was too late by then?

A - Yeah, for sure.

Q - So you didn't like him telling you what to do?

A - No, not at all. I don't like anyone telling me what to do.

Social control theory posits that a strong attachment to significant others increases adherence to conventional norms and values, and consequently decreases the likelihood of criminal behaviour. According to Hirschi (1969: 94), the more strongly a child is attached to their parents, the more strongly he is bound to their expectations, and therefore the more strongly he is bound to conformity with the legal norms of the larger system. However, the majority of these participants do not describe conventional parents or families. Despite the fact that most participants reported a strong attachment to their mothers, only ten participants were living with their mothers prior to their incarceration. Not surprisingly, participants reported a weak attachment to their fathers; however, only four participants indicated that they had been living with their fathers prior to their incarceration. It can be argued that the influence of the parental attachment has been significantly reduced, because most participants do not live with their parents.

Peers

In addition to the influence of family, peers also serve as a source of informal control. Paternoster (1988) found that the influence of parents tends to wane over the high school period, while the influence of friends became slightly stronger. According to Hirschi (1969),

the less cohesive the peer group, the greater the involvement in delinquency. Social control theory presumes that attachment to a peer group decreases the likelihood of deviant behaviour.

When asked how many close friends they have, responses varied from one to one hundred. Most participants were realistic about the number of close friends, with thirteen participants indicating that they had fewer than ten close friends. One participant responded:

Close friends? Friends that are actually true friends, probably eight. That I can trust with my life, eight. Like, a lot of my friends, like, they're my boys and stuff, but I wouldn't trust them to come down, if the cops are trying to get them to talk. Like, one of my boys did nine months in Bluewater for a crime I did. I had four b&e's already, we did another b&e, and we stole a car, and we got arrested, and let out on bail, and we did another b&e, and he just took the rap for everything. He was involved, but like I should have went down for it too. But he just said, 'No I'll take the rap for it, cause you're already going up on four b&e's.' You know. That's my best friend.

Participants were questioned on whether they cared about what their friends thought of them. Ten youth indicated that they did care what their friends think of them. This participant indicated that he did care:

Cause I don't want them to think I'm stupid. I don't want them to think bad of me.

Another participant responded:

Yeah, they're my boys. I don't know, I just, never done anything to hurt my boys, I want them to think good of me, you know.

Nine respondents indicated that they did not care what their friends think of them. One participant indicated that he did not care what his friends think of him, and stated:

Cause they're just friends, they ain't no one important.

This participant also replied:

I don't really care what nobody says.

Participants who reported that they had more than ten close friends were more likely to indicate that they did not care what their friends think of them (See Table 9). Of the seven participants who responded that they had ten or more close friends, six participants indicated that they did not care what their friends think of them. In contrast, nine of the thirteen participants who identified less than ten close friends cared what their friends think of them.

Table 9 - Attachment to Peers

	Care what their friends think of them	Don't care what their friends think of them	No response	Total
Less than 10 'close' friends	9 (45%)	3 (15%)	1 (5%)	13 (65%)
10 or more 'close' friends	1 (5%)	6 (30%)	0 (0%)	7 (35%)
Total	10 (50%)	9 (45%)	1 (5%)	20 (100%)

According to Hirschi (1969), the cohesiveness or attachment of the peer group and the commission of delinquency are critically linked. The less cohesive the gang, the greater the involvement in delinquency. Those participants who reported that their peer group is large, and that they do not care what their friends think, are unlikely to be as closely attached to their peers as the participants who reported a smaller peer group. Consequently, those youth

who indicated a lack of attachment are likely to be at higher risk for future criminal activity.

Criminal Behaviour of Peers

The likelihood of future criminal behaviour is influenced by the delinquent values and behaviour of the peer group. When asked how many of the people that they hang around with break the law, responses varied from none to all of the people the participants hang around. Only five of the twenty participants indicated that fewer than half of their friends break the law. Fifteen of the twenty participants indicated that more than half of their peers break the law. This participant responded:

Most of them. Like ninety percent of them do crime. I have some friends that don't commit crimes, but I rarely ever talk to them.

When asked if they ever feel pressure from their friends to break the law, only three participants indicated that they do occasionally feel pressure to break the law. The vast majority of the respondents indicated that they did not feel pressure from their friends to break the law. This participant responded:

I've got my own mind to think for myself. I just get stupid when I'm drunk, and then I like to go out and cause trouble.

Another participant responded:

They don't pressure me into anything. They're straight. If they say something, like you want to go do something, they ask me, if I say no, it's no. They don't bother me about it. It's my decision.

Sixteen participants responded that they have friends who would disapprove of them breaking the law. One participant indicated:

I don't know disapprove but, like they wouldn't, you know they wouldn't support it.

Several participants noted that female friends were more likely to express disapproval of law breaking behaviour:

I get lectures all the time when I'm on the phone with people. Mostly girls, but everyone in general.

Another participant responded:

Well, one in specific... she's always, you know, had a normal life, and she does really good in school.... She always gives me advice, you know and she'll tell me what to do in a situation, or something like that. When I have done something wrong and she finds out about it she gives me hell.

Only four participants responded that their friends had not indicated disapproval for breaking the law. According to this participant:

None of my tight friends. They don't care, you know. It's my choice, just like it's their choice.

To summarize, social control theory predicts that the influence of the peer group decreases the likelihood of deviant behaviour. Clearly, the majority of participants reported the presence of a delinquent peer group. While participants reported having law abiding friends, these peers were primarily identified as casual friends, or various female friends who did not approve of the lawbreaking behaviour.

Participants also indicated an attachment to their peer group. The largest proportion of participants volunteered that their peer group was small. These participants were most likely to indicate that they cared what their friends thought. In contrast, participants reporting a large peer group were most likely to indicate that they did not care what their

friends thought. Those participants who reported a weak attachment to their peer group are at higher risk for future criminal behaviour. This analysis will now examine the participants' perceptions of morality.

Morality

School, employment, and significant others have all been examined as sources of informal controls, which influence the socialization process of the participants and impacts upon the internalization of values. Accordingly, social control theories emphasize the quality of the process of socialization, as indicated through adherence to norms and values. Respondents were questioned on their moral commitment to norms and social values.

How Wrong is it to Break the Law?

Participants were asked how wrong it is to break the law. Twelve participants acknowledged that it is wrong or really wrong to break the law. When asked how wrong it is to break the law, this participant indicated that breaking the law is very wrong:

Why should we? Better stuff to do than break the law. Do something with your life. Go out and get a job. Make money the real way instead of stealing from people to get money. Go out and get a job, work for your money.

This respondent contemplated:

It's wrong, cause you victimize people. Chances are they did nothing wrong to you. Just hope they get money or whatever. It's real wrong, but people just don't think like that when they're doing crime.... They have their mind set on making money. What they're going to do.

Four participants responded that it 'depends,' on either the law or the circumstances.

This participant responded:

How wrong? Depends on what you break the law for. If you have a kid or

something, need something really bad, I would do it, I wouldn't even think twice.... That's not why I do it. Some laws are stupid, they shouldn't even be there.

Another participant replied:

Depends what you do.... I don't think smoking weed's wrong. And drinking once in a while. Like if you're an alcoholic then forget it, you should be in jail. I don't know, like driving without a license, everyone needs to drive.

Only three participants indicated that it is not wrong to break the law. This participant said:

I don't really care about the law getting broke.... Cause there are so many people doing it. Eventually it will change. It will take a long time, but it will.... Some of the laws will get took down or switched.

Another participant stated:

I don't think it's wrong. It doesn't matter to me.... Cause I break the law [laughs].... It's gonna start. Like when I get out I ain't gonna break the law no more, it's just that, cause I know that it's not right, but the law, I don't care about the law, I don't care about the government or anybody. I care about myself, and my family, and my friends.

To sum, the majority of the participants agree that in general, it is wrong to break the law. Several participants qualified their response, depending on the law involved. Despite the fact that these participants have all reported breaking the law, most participants have reportedly internalized a conventional value system. Only three participants reported that they did not believe that it was wrong to break the law. Belief systems were further examined in relation to robbery, assault, and break and entering.

Is it Wrong to Commit Robbery?

When asked if they thought that it was wrong to rob someone, eighteen of the twenty participants said that it is wrong to rob someone (See Table 10). Most participants acknowledged that robbing victimizes innocent people. One participant indicated:

Yeah, for sure. It's taking their personal property, what they obviously earned.

Table 10 - Morality and Experiential Effect (Robbery)

	Committed robbery in the past year	Did not commit robbery in past year	Total
Wrong to commit robbery	3 (15%)	15 (75%)	18 (90%)
Not wrong to commit robbery	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Depends upon circumstances	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	2 (10%)
Total	4 (20%)	16 (80%)	20 (100%)

This participant responded:

Q - Do you think it is wrong to rob someone?

A - Yeah.

Q - How come?

A - Just, because they work so hard for their stuff, and then some little punk like me comes by, takes it from them, that ain't right.

Q - But you do it anyway?

A - Well, not anymore. I used to do it.

Several of these participants also indicated that even though they know that it is wrong to rob someone, they do it anyway. One participant indicated:

Q - Do you think it is wrong to rob someone?

A - Yeah, I know it's wrong to rob people.

Q - But you do it any ways?

A - Yeah.

This participant stated:

I'm not sure, yeah, it's wrong to rob them but, you got to do what you got to do.

The remaining two participants both responded that it 'depends' who you are robbing. One participant replied:

It all depends on who you're robbing [laughs]. If you're robbing another dealer it don't matter. You know, that you're robbing. But if you're robbing some old lady [laughs] you know, that ain't right.

The other participant responded:

It depends on what they do to you. Unless you need it to survive. If it's like just an innocent person.

To sum, eighteen of the twenty participants indicated that they agree that it is wrong to rob someone. Participants recognized that robbing from people victimizes them, and only four of these eighteen participants later admitted that they had robbed someone in the past year. Thus, there appears generally to be a link between the feeling that robbery is wrong and the respondents' behaviour.

Is it Wrong to Hospitalize Someone?

When asked if they thought that it was wrong to beat someone up so bad they have to be hospitalized, only five participants indicated that they thought it was wrong (See Table 11). This participant replied:

Nobody don't deserve to get beat up man.

Table 11 - Morality and Experiential Effect (Assault)

	Committed assault in the past year	Did not commit assault in past year	Don't know if committed assault	Total
Wrong to commit assault	1 (5%)	3 (15%)	1 (5%)	5 (25%)
Not wrong to commit assault	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Depends upon circumstances	8 (40%)	6 (30%)	1 (5%)	15 (75%)
Total	9 (45%)	9 (45%)	2 (10%)	20 (100%)

Another participant responded:

That's definitely wrong. That's endangering somebody's life. For you to do something like that there'd have to be something really wrong with your head.

In contrast, fifteen participants responded with some variation of 'it depends what they did to deserve the beating.' These respondents justified beating someone up if it was in self defence, if the person stole from him, if the person ratted on him or his friends, if the

person hurt his family, if the person hit his girlfriend, if the person slept with his girlfriend, if the person raped someone, or if the person was a 'diddler.' One participant said:

Depends on if the guy deserves it, like if the guy was going to try to kill you, or something like that, and you were able to beat him, it might go a little, like hospitalization might be a little too much, but if the guy tried to kill you first, or put you in the hospital, I think it's fair to take care of him, put him in the hospital.... Otherwise I think it's kind of stupid, just to beat the hell out of him, put him in the hospital.

Another participant responded:

If you're a snitch, I guess they deserved it. One of my boys beat up this snitch, about a month back, hospitalized him. The other one got ran over by a car [laughs]. When you're from certain crews, there's such a thing as going down and being solid, even if you didn't do the crime. Well you still got to be solid. You can't say yeah, my friend did it, it wasn't me.... Otherwise, there isn't no reason to fight. I don't start or pick fights or nothing, but if it comes to me [laughs] some people get hospitalized.

The majority of participants did not feel that it would be wrong to badly assault another person under certain conditions; however, most participants did object to assaulting an 'innocent person.' Five participants responded that it was wrong to badly assault another person, with one of these individuals later reporting doing so in the past year. However, under certain circumstances, fifteen participants did not feel that it was wrong to assault someone, and eight participants reported doing so in the past year. Again, a pattern is evident with moral values; that is, violence under certain circumstances appears to be linked to the behaviour.

Is it Wrong to Break into a House?

When asked if they thought that it was wrong to break into a house, eighteen participants responded that it was wrong (See Table 12). One participant responded:

It's not your property, it's not your place to be doing it. You never know if someone's going to be in the house, or if someone you know owns that house or lives in it, or it could be one of your family members. Like I would feel bad if it was one of my family members.

Table 12 - Morality and Experiential Effect (Break and Enter)

	Committed break and enter in the past year	Did not commit break and enter in past year	Total
Wrong to commit break and enter	10 (50%)	8 (40%)	18 (90%)
Not wrong to commit break and enter	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)
No answer	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)
Total	11 (55%)	9 (45%)	20 (100%)

This participant responded:

I think that's real wrong. They can't sleep at night cause they don't know if someone else is gonna break into the house while they're sleeping, you know. Invasion of people's privacy, come home and find your house turned upside down. I got my house broken into too, but they didn't really took nothing, they just took like a GameBoy, and an alarm clock, and a VCR, you know. Not like me, I'll drive up, with a loading truck right up in your driveway, and clear out your house, I don't care.... I knew it was wrong, cause like my house got broken into, and my mom tripped, she couldn't sleep for a couple of days. I don't know, I was just drunk, wasn't in the right state of mind [yawns].

Participants were likely to refer to the use of alcohol in the commission of the crime. This participant reflected:

Yeah, I think that's real wrong. I think that's worse than robbing someone. People work so hard to have a nice home, and then somebody comes in and destroys it, and takes their valuable stuff, take a ring that was passed down through generations. I think that's wrong. But I never looked at it like that. I just looked at it as money.... I've had time to sit and think about it. Before I didn't, I was always drunk. I didn't have time, the only time I had was to drink. And I don't think I could do that again.

Only one participant did not feel that it is wrong to break into a house. He replied:

Q - Do you think it is wrong to break into a house?

A - Nope.

Q - Why not?

A - Cause I do it [laughs].

Q - So you don't think it's wrong at all?

A - Well it might be, but I don't see why.

Similar to robbery, the majority of participants felt that it was wrong to break into a house. Eighteen participants responded that they felt that it was wrong to break into a house, with the majority recognizing that it victimizes innocent people. However, ten of these eighteen participants later admitted that they had committed at least one break and enter in the past year. Although these participants acknowledge that it was wrong to commit break and enter, they were able to neutralize these feelings, and commit the offence anyway. Participants justified their behaviour by indicating that they needed the money, or that they were under the influence of drugs or alcohol when they committed the offence. Thus, we see with break and enter evidence of conditions that neutralize morals and values, which might otherwise inhibit this behaviour.

While the majority of participants indicated that in general, it is wrong to break the law, responses were more defined by offence type. The majority of participants indicated

that it is wrong to rob someone, or to break into a house. Participants responded that it is not appropriate to victimize an innocent person, through either a robbery, assault, or a break and enter. Similarly, participants also indicated that it is wrong to assault another person, as long as they are innocent of wrong doing. However, the participants justified an assault if it was in self defense, if the person stole from the participant, if the person ratted on either the participant or his friends, if the person hurt his family and/or his girlfriend, if the person slept with his girlfriend, or if the person was a sex offender.

Despite the fact that participants demonstrated an understanding that criminal behaviour is inappropriate, participants also indicated participating in this type of behaviour. While it could be argued that the youth have internalized the norms and values of the conventional society concerning some types of criminal behaviour, it is evident that this internalization did not prevent or inhibit these young offenders from breaking the law in the past.

Sykes and Matza (1957) propose that one becomes 'free' to act delinquent through the use of techniques of neutralization. By neutralizing or suspending their commitment to social values, the offenders become free to commit delinquent acts. The participants frequently denied responsibility for delinquent behaviour, and indicated that they were under the influence of substances. Offenders also tended to deny injury to the victim, indicating that they needed money, and that the victim can afford the loss — especially others who earn their money illegally. Participants were also likely to use Sykes and Matza's technique of 'condemnation of the condemners,' by condemning the laws (and the enforcers of the law) that they believe to be inappropriate. In addition, the appeal to higher loyalties is evident, with loyalty to peers paramount. Finally, the technique used most frequently to neutralize commitment to social values was a denial of the victim. Participants indicated that it would not be wrong to steal from or assault certain types of people because they deserved the offence, and therefore were not victimized. Consequently, it becomes questionable if these beliefs will influence future behaviour, or if the youth will continue to 'neutralize' the norms of conventional society in the future.

To summarize informal social control theory, criminal behaviour can be explained by

identifying social factors working to prevent persons from committing deviant behaviour. This analysis has examined the educational system, employment, familial relationships, peer groups, and moral values and belief systems. As discussed, these youth experienced difficulties succeeding within the conventional educational system prior to their incarceration. However, progress has been demonstrated while attending the in-house school, and the offenders' behaviour upon release may be predicated on how future schooling progresses. Offenders appear to have some commitment to society through occupational aspirations. However, these aspirations may be unrealistic, resulting in frustration and criminal behaviour.

Familial relationships are characterized by an instability in living arrangements, with the youth often moving from residence to residence. Participants reportedly belong to a disadvantaged social class of un- and under-employed families. While participants appeared to have formed an attachment with their parents and significant others, participants also indicated that they are exposed to various criminal activities on the part of immediate and extended family members. In spite of the reported perception that their family members care about their law breaking behaviour, the encouragement of criminal activity on the part of the participants' family members serves to counteract the possible deterrent effect of the influence of family members. In addition, most participants reported loose associations with a criminally inclined peer group, and indicated they felt little influence of these people's pressures or morality, increasing the risk of future criminal behaviour. Finally, in spite of the fact that the participants acknowledge that criminal behaviour is wrong, they admit to committing criminal acts, and in many cases, are able to provide justifications for these acts.

Social control theory allows for the identification of these youth as an at-risk population for future criminal activity. Without intervention to control the factors discussed above, it is likely that these youth will continue to re-offend upon release. In order to increase the influence of social controls on these youth, the community must continue to ensure educational success and worthwhile employment. The presence of positive role models — both familial and within peer groups — must also be established. However, the breakdown of these informal controls leaves formal social controls as the main source

impacting criminal behaviour. This analysis will now turn to an evaluation of more formally instituted methods of social control, including previous police contact, experience within the court system, custodial experience, knowledge and perceptions of a strict discipline program, certainty of punishment, probability of deterrence, and perceived fairness of punishment.

Formal Social Control

Deterrence theory posits that the use of formal sanctions as deterrents to crime is dependent upon perceptions of the certainty, severity, and celerity of punishment. Taken from a rational choice model, deterrence theory presumes that potential offenders weigh the possibility of apprehension, along with the likelihood and severity of punishment if apprehended, with the expected benefits or rewards of the illegal behaviour. Accordingly, the threat of legal sanctions is imposed in order to prevent criminal behaviour. The application of formal sanctions, including contact with the police, experience within the criminal justice system, and the threat of punishment will be examined.

Relations with Police

Participants were asked to describe their previous contact with the police. Nineteen of the twenty participants indicated that their previous police contact had been extensive. According to one participant:

I've been in holding cells like thirty times. That one guy, the big guy that's here, he just told me today, he said, 'You write your name in the holding cell a lot eh?' I said, 'Yeah, every time I'm in there.' 'Like I see your name on the wall like forty times.' That's how many times I've been in there. They always put me in the same cell and I always put my name on it. I don't plan on coming back no more.

This participant described:

The first time I ever got brought home by the police was when I was ten....

They're not real generous. They're rude. I've been threatened to be beat up. They've never hit me, though. They've hurt me before. I know a lot of people who have been beaten up by the police.

Participants reported that the police frequently 'pull them over' as they are walking down the street, and harass them without cause. This participant indicated:

Q - Have you had a lot of contact with the police?

A - What do you mean?

Q - Any kind of contact.

A - Like what?

Q - Casual contact.

A - Like what, them pulling me over, searching me? Oh harassment? Of course.

Q - What kind of harassment?

A - Them bugging me. They pull me over, search me for no reason. Stuff like that.

Q - Do they do that often?

A - Haven't had it for a while. Like six months ago maybe. There's no reason why they should suspect me for doing anything, cause I don't do anything....

Q - So the police harass you quite a bit?

A - Enough. They shouldn't even bug me unless they have suspicion of me doing something. I don't even do nothing. It's only cops I know, cops that recognize me.

Q - They see you and think you're up to trouble?

A - Yup.

When asked what they thought about the police, responses varied in intensity. Not surprisingly, in light of the police contact described, no participant expressed that they liked the police. Three participants did acknowledge that there are both good and bad police officers. One participant noted:

They're all right I guess. Some of them can be fuckheads.... The way they act, what they do to you if they catch you, and then they cover it up somehow.... I got beat up a couple of times. I brought it up with my lawyer, and they cover it up. Like they say that I assaulted them first, and I was just doing my job, keeping them off me, make it look like self defence or something.

Six participants identified that, while they did not like the police, they understood that the police are just doing their job. One participant indicated:

They're just doing their job, it's their job, I expect them to do it. Without them, the whole world would be chaos. They must be doing something right.

The remaining eleven participants expressed intense dislike towards the police. Most indicated that they had received some form of harassment from the police. This participant responded:

They think they can do anything to everybody. They just think they own the world. Every time I walk down the street they pull me over for nothing. Just for nothing, just to bother me, to ask a question, to waste my time. If I'm trying to get somewhere quick they waste my time. And they'll know that I'm trying to get somewhere too, cause I'll try talking them out of it and stuff to make them leave and everything, and they'll like get out of the car, search me, put the cuffs on me for about ten minutes, put me in the back of the car, and then they'll let me go, just for like five questions. And then make me sit there while they do a whole bunch of paperwork, run my name through, and everything.

Another responded:

Assholes. I don't really like them. If I had to do a favour for them, I'd rather let them die [laughs].... They're pigs, and they don't know how to run, or they'd catch me by now. They usually need rats to catch me. If you ain't got a crime partner, they'll never catch you. As long as your crime partner is solid.

Finally, this participant cited personal experience:

They're assholes, dickheads, little pussies too. Got to 'cuff me to beat me up, can't fight me one on one, cause I've asked them. They say, 'No I can't do that.' Ask them to take off their badges. No, they can't do that. They can cuff me, have me strapped down to a stretcher and beat the shit out of you, bitches. I hate 'em. They think they are the law, but they ain't. They just enforce it.

They think they can do whatever they want to. They think they're tough, beating up a kid. I hate 'em, straight up. That's my feelings towards cops.

As determined by Hirschi (1969), those youth who report engaging in more criminal behaviour are more likely to report a lack of respect toward the police. While the described contact with the police may lead to an increasing lack of respect for the law, Hirschi (1969) indicates that the relation between respect for the police and the commission of delinquent acts is not wholly a consequence of this contact. Notwithstanding, youth who have a lack of respect for the law are more likely to report involvement in criminal behaviour.

Sherman (1993) defines defiance as the net increase in the prevalence, incidence, or seriousness of future offending against a sanctioning community caused by a proud, shameless reaction to the administration of a criminal sanction. According to Sherman, defiance occurs when the sanctioning agent behaves with disrespect for the offender, or the sanction is substantively arbitrary, discriminatory, excessive, undeserved, or otherwise unjust. Those participants who reported that the police frequently harass them for no reason, and who reported feelings of intense dislike toward police officers may react in a defiant manner as a result of the perceived unjust sanction. Negative contact with the police may actually increase criminal behaviour in a defiant reaction to authority. In addition to the formality of contact with the police, exposure to the criminal justice system was also examined.

Experience within the Criminal Justice System

Deterrence theory predicts that the certainty, severity, and celerity of punishment affect the offender's decision making. Accordingly, this would indicate that a swift and severe punishment administered by the criminal justice system would serve to reduce future criminal behaviour.

Experience in Court

When asked what their experience in court was like, eleven participants were largely

nonchalant or neutral about their court experiences (See Table 13). One participant explained:

I've been to court a lot of times, someday I'll get a short sentence, someday I'll get a real big sentence. Like a merry go round, go around and round and round and round.

Table 13 - Experiential Effect and Court Experiences

	Neutral Court Experiences	Negative Court Experiences	Total
Multiple court appearances	8 (40%)	3 (15%)	11 (55%)
Few court appearances	3 (15%)	6 (30%)	9 (45%)
Total	11 (55%)	9 (45%)	20 (100%)

This respondent indicated:

Sucked. I got a year. Then I just kept getting more charges when I was in custody.... I used to go [to court] every Tuesday for eight months [laughs]. Kept getting remanded and remanded and remanded. Mom used to have to drive me every Tuesday for like eight months. Then I finally got picked up on a breach and they just held me.

Several participants indicated that they had been to court numerous times, especially as a result of remands. According to this participant:

I've had numerous court dates. Don't like the judges, the judges don't like me.

Another participant described:

Boring. I hated it. To have to go back and forth, back and forth.... Home to court, home to court.... Custody to court too. They should just get it done with you know. They should have a trial right there. I don't really care, cause my lawyer, that's what I pay my lawyer for. To get me off charges. But you can only do so much, and then you're stuck, and there's nothing you can do. Unless you're absolutely innocent. There's been times I've been guilty as sin and gotten off charges. Lack of evidence, stuff like that. I don't leave a trail. The courts, they say I'm a menace to society too. They did, I thought that was so ignorant, to say something like that. Pissed me off. Do I look like a menace to society?

Nine participants indicated that their court experience was negative, and that they did not like their court experience. One participant described:

The first time I was scared because I didn't know what was going to happen. The last time, I was kind of shocked with the punishment. I got twenty-four months probation, three months open, thirty days secure. My lawyer told me I was only going to get probation and community service.

Another participant volunteered that he found the process confusing:

I was really nervous. Sometimes I didn't really understand what the lawyers and judges were saying because they were all using legal terms and I was really confused. It's not really a nice experience.

This participant described his court experience, and reported that this was the first time that he had broken into a house:

Not good. Friends and stuff had to see me leave. I guess I hate it. The judge was yelling at me.... Well not yelling at me, but putting me down for what I did.

As indicated in Table 13, those participants who indicated a negative experiences within the courtroom tended to be inexperienced court-goers. In contrast, the participants who demonstrated casual or nonchalant attitudes toward the courtroom experience were more likely to have indicated multiple court appearances and subsequent remands. For those 'naive' offenders who reported negative reactions to their experiences in court, the actual courtroom experience may serve as a form of punishment, resulting in a deterrent effect. As the number of courtroom visits increases, participants appear to be influenced by an experiential effect, decreasing the impact or the perceived seriousness of the formal sanction.

According to traditional deterrence theory, the celerity of punishment was considered one of the most important elements of deterrence, as it was considered to be an important mechanism facilitating the development of a causal association between the offence and the punishment (Clark, 1988). If so, the delay experienced by the accused within the criminal justice system would impact the projected deterrent effect of the punishment meted out. If the court process is not considered a part of the punishment that the young offender suffers, the repeated delays within the criminal justice system would suggest that participants are less likely to be deterred from criminal activity, as they are cognizant of the fact that punishment is not immediate. However, while it might be argued that the court process itself can be seen as punishment, Clark (1988) suggests that the effect of celerity becomes spurious when other variables (such as severity, cognitive processing, extra-legal variables) are introduced. Hence, the speed of the processing through the criminal justice system may not impact the offender's decision to act criminally, other than further decreasing the offender's respect for the law.

In fact, Gray et al. (1982, Miranne and Gray (1987), Schneider and Ervin (1990), and Yu (1994) all found that a longer time lag between the offence and the disposition results in fewer subsequent offences. It has been theorized that the delay in sentencing may result in an amplification of fear and apprehension for the unexperienced punishment, thereby serving as a stronger deterrent (Gray et al., 1982). It is possible that the time lag in sentencing causes a deterrent effect when the experience at court has been negative. As

indicated above, the more experienced offenders demonstrate nonchalant attitudes toward attendance at court. However, some participants did report feelings of nervousness and fear during their experience in court, in part due to their lack of familiarity with the process. The inexperienced participants were more likely to have a negative experience in court, and are consequently more likely to be influenced by the threat of both a court appearance and the imposition of a formal sanction. In addition to the court appearance, previous custodial experiences will also be considered.

Custodial Experience

Respondents were asked to describe their custodial history, which ranged from detention centres, open custody, and secure custody facilities. At the time of the interview, the length of stay at the open custody facility varied from three days to seven and a half months. The average length of stay at the time of the interview was 17.1 days. Nine respondents reported having two or fewer previous custodial experiences, and eleven respondents reported having three or more previous custodial experiences.

As indicated in Table 14, those participants who reported negative experiences while staying at the House were more likely to have reported two or fewer previous custodial experiences. Further, those participants who reported multiple previous custodial experiences were more likely to report positive experiences while staying at the facility. In other words, those participants who reported an extensive custodial history tended to adjust well to the facility, and did not consider the experience to be particularly severe.

When asked what they thought of the open custody facility, fifteen of the twenty participants indicated that they liked it at the facility. This participant described:

It's good, they got a really good program, the staff are nice, they go easy on you. They have MRT groups, they're somewhat helpful. They make you take a look at what you have done and where you are going, give you a sense of direction.

Another participant replied:

Q - What do you think of it here?

A - Ah, it's all right. I had a rough start when I first got here, but I'm doing good now. I'm on level two.

Q - How come you had a rough start?

A - Just because of my attitude. I thought all the staff was out to get me. I just have a real bad temper.

Table 14 - Experiential Effect and Perceptions of Facility

	Positive perception of the House	Negative perception of the House	Total
3 or more previous custodial experiences	10 (50%)	1 (5%)	11 (55%)
2 or fewer previous custodial experiences	5 (25%)	4 (20%)	9 (45%)
Total	15 (75%)	5 (25%)	20 (100%)

Another participant indicated:

It's all right I think. They've got a good little program going on.

Seven of these participants compared the facility to other custodial places that they had been, including other open and secure custody facilities. One participant responded:

It's alright, it's better than the county. I'm doing dead time in the county. The county don't bother me, but you get to see daylight. The only daylight you see up there is through bars, through a little window, that's the only daylight you see. I see freedom here, I get my own room, I get to wear my own clothes, take a shower, it's real food. Everything is real here. It's nasty stuff up there.

Another participant replied:

I like it. Like it's better than [other facility], it's more structured, they got a program here, you know. [The other facility] has got levels, but all you can do is sit around, you know.

Participants also referred to the Moral Reconciliation Therapy (MRT) program used at the facility. Five of these fifteen participants indicated that the program was 'good.' One participant said:

I think the MRT, I think that's a good program, you know if you can't trust somebody, how can you trust them to move up the level and get along with people, you know. How's they supposed to get along?

Another participant discussed the program:

Doing the MRT and stuff, it helps you learn, and you get to talk about your crime with the staff here and stuff, and it helps so you don't want to do crime no more.

Participants also noted privileges extended at this facility:

It's alright. It's not as bad as secure. You're allowed to have cigarettes. That's good, cause you don't lose your temper easily.

This participant also referred to smoking:

It's okay. Better than most open custodies.... It's more relaxed. You can smoke here.

Another participant volunteered:

I get along with all the people here, it's pretty neat, you don't get this stuff here at the jail.

In contrast, five participants were not happy with their experiences in the open custody facility. Most of these complaints were related to problems getting along with staff or disciplinary problems. One participant explained:

It's okay, I don't know, it's not that great. The staff have a lot of different things that they make up as they go along.... Different rules. They just say you're not allowed to do this, you're not allowed to do that. Then you look in the rule book and it's not there.... Like whispering. Whispering to each other. They say you're not allowed to do that, but it's not in the rules or anything like that. So you could be talking to someone private, that you don't want them to hear, like you could be talking about drugs or something like that.

Another participant complained:

A - At this House it's shitty.

Q - Shitty?

A - Uhuh, it's messed up.

Q - How come?

A - Cause the staff don't let you slide here for nothing.

Q - You mean you can't get away with anything?

A - Yeah.

Q - Like what?

A - Anything, you say something wrong, and they're grounding you.

Q - Have you been grounded since you've been here?

A - Yeah.

Q - For what?

A - Smoking in the bathroom, and answering the telephone.

This participant explained:

I don't know, it's just their program just doesn't suit me. Like in my eyes, if like I want to do something, I'm going to do it, what I want to do. But they're forcing us to go to school here, they force us to. What else? They force us to do our chores, like do it right there and then, like that's not how it's supposed to be done.

This same participant was also dissatisfied with other aspects of the program, requesting longer family visits and more personal space:

My brother... has to drive two hours here and two hours back for a one hour visit.... Personal space. There's none here whatsoever. We're up here all day at school until three o'clock in the afternoon. You've got to sit downstairs until supper. Then it's another hour past supper. From five until nine you're sitting downstairs, then at nine, whatever, you go for a cigarette, get downstairs for another hour until eleven o'clock. At eleven o'clock we're back upstairs. I don't even see any reason to have a stereo, you can't listen to it. Half hour when you go to bed, that's about it.

Participants unhappy with the facility also indicated dissatisfaction with the MRT program.

This participant responded:

I don't like it, like the MRT part of it. I don't like it. That hasn't done nothing for me yet. Probably cause I haven't been putting it to use, it's boring, I don't like it.

Another participant replied vehemently:

MRT is pointless, just annoying and stupid, just like stupid anger management. It doesn't do a thing for you, it just makes you more mad, for being there and having to listen to their reasons for what your problems are. Like who are they to tell me what my problems are?... I'd rather just sit there, be locked up, than have to do MRT's. Those things are so pointless it's not even funny.

In general, participants reported relatively positive experiences while staying at the open custody facility. Participants who reported numerous previous custodial experiences were more often satisfied with the open custody facility, and participants who reported few previous custodial experiences were more often dissatisfied with the program. Participants tended to compare experiences at different open and closed facilities. Facility staff also played a key role in the experience of the offender. Most participants noted that they got

along with the staff, while some participants reacted negatively to the imposition of perceived arbitrary rules.

To sum, the majority of participants reported relatively positive experiences while staying at the open custody facility. It is clear that these participants do not perceive the experience in this open custody facility to be exceptionally severe. In fact, most participants commented positively on the benefits of the programming available to them while at the House. While the facility may not play a deterrent role for these participants, it is evident that most of these youth have indicated an attachment to the staff and the facility. However, some participants did respond negatively to their experiences at the facility. Those participants reacting negatively to the authority imposed by staff members may react defiantly, as previously outlined, elevating their risk of future criminal behaviour both while in custody, and upon release. Further, even the youth positively attached to the House may be at risk for future criminal behaviour upon release, if this attachment is not replaced with other meaningful activities, such as school or employment.

Certainty of Punishment

Deterrence theory predicts that the greater the certainty of apprehension and punishment, the greater the ability to deter. Participants were questioned on their likelihood of apprehension if they committed a robbery, assault, and break and enter.

Robbery

When asked if they thought that they would be caught by the police if they robbed someone, seven participants indicated that they thought that they would be caught (See Table 15). Five of these participants later reported that they had not robbed anyone in the past twelve months. Only two participants indicated that they had been previously apprehended for committing robbery; both of these participants responded that they were likely to be caught by the police if they robbed someone. Several participants indicated that they might be caught because they came from a small town. This participant stated:

Because how can you rob someone and get away with it? If you rob someone you're gonna be, like you're gonna be pretty close to them, they're going to get a description of you, and me being from a small town, where a lot of people know you, and a lot of police know you because you have a criminal record, you're going to be busted right away.

Table 15 - Certainty of Punishment and Experiential Effect (Robbery)*

	Committed robbery and was apprehended	Committed robbery and was not apprehended	Did not previously commit robbery	Total
Likely to be apprehended	2 (10%)	0 (0%)	5 (25%)	7 (35%)
Not likely to be apprehended	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	5 (25%)	6 (30%)
Apprehension dependent upon circumstances/ planning	0 (0%)	3 (15%)	4 (20%)	7 (35%)
Total	2 (10%)	4 (20%)	14 (70%)	20 (100%)

* Includes two robberies committed more than one year ago.

Several participants indicated that apprehension was possible, sooner or later:

You're going to get caught eventually, just a period of time.

Six participants indicated that they would not be caught if they robbed someone. All six reported that if they did commit a robbery, they would do it in such a way so as to not be caught. Of these six participants, five volunteered that they had never robbed anyone before. One participant explained:

Q - If you robbed someone, do you think that you would be caught by the police?

A - No.

Q - Why not?

A - Cause I wouldn't leave no evidence. I wouldn't get caught unless the cops were right there and they saw me.

An additional seven participants indicated that whether or not they were caught would depend on how they committed the robbery. This participant summed up the factors:

Depends on how I do it. Depends on where I do it. Depends on when I do it.

Four of these participants later indicated that they had not robbed anyone in the past year.

The majority of participants reported that they would not be caught if they robbed another person, or that they would be able to plan the circumstances of a robbery in such a way that the risk of apprehension was low. These responses indicate a level of rationality consistent with deterrence theory. In effect, according to these participants, the certainty of punishment was low. Regardless of the perceived severity of punishment for this offence, participants felt that it would be unlikely that they would be caught if they committed a robbery. This would indicate that the deterrent effect of the threat of punishment would be low, as most of the participants did not see themselves as likely to be apprehended, thus making the severity of punishment a moot point.

Assault

When asked if they thought that they would be caught by the police if they 'beat someone up really bad,' seven participants indicated that they thought that they might or would be caught (See Table 16). Five of these seven participants indicated that in the past year they had not 'beaten anyone up' so badly that they probably needed a doctor. One participant replied:

Yeah. Cause if you beat someone up real bad, you know and you caused them

a lot of pain, suffering, and they're in the hospital or something, well, it's gonna cost them, and their family in hospital bills and stuff like that. So their family is going to pressure them to give up whoever did it. And if they're that angry, of course they're going to give you up.

Table 16 - Certainty of Punishment and Experiential Effect (Assault)*

	Committed assault and was apprehended	Committed assault and was not apprehended	Did not previously commit assault	Total
Likely to be apprehended	2 (10%)	0 (0%)	5 (25%)	7 (35%)
Not likely to be apprehended	2 (10%)	1 (5%)	2 (10%)	5 (25%)
Apprehension dependent upon circumstances/ planning	5 (25%)	0 (0%)	3 (15%)	8 (40%)
Total	9 (45%)	1 (5%)	10 (50%)	20 (100%)

* Includes one assault that occurred more than one year ago.

Five participants indicated that they would not be caught by the police if they beat someone up really bad. Again, the participants indicated that they did not think that they would be caught because they would plan the offence. Of these five, three participants volunteered that in the past year, they had 'beaten at least one person up' so badly that they thought that they probably needed a doctor. Two of these three participants had previously been apprehended for committing assault. This participant described how he would commit an assault without being caught:

I would do it somewhere that no one could see, and no one's around, and no

one would be with me and no one would be with him, or whoever it is. I would do it to someone that don't know me, don't know my name, don't know what I look like, well they probably would know what I'd look like but I'd probably wear something that they don't remember, and when I leave change.

Eight participants responded that whether or not they were caught by the police would depend on who they beat up, and how well the crime was planned out. Five of these eight participants later admitted that in the past year, they had beaten someone up so badly that they probably needed a doctor. All five of these participants admitted that they had been previously apprehended for committing assault. One participant stated:

Depends on where it was at and who it was. Guaranteed I could plan it. I'd have people with walkie talkies sitting on the roof, watching for cops. We could plan out the biggest event if we wanted to.

Participants once again implied that the certainty of punishment for assault was low. Participants reported that they would likely not be apprehended, or that the likelihood of apprehension would be low if they successfully planned the circumstances of the offence. Further, an experiential effect was evident, as participants who reported that they had previously been apprehended for assaulting someone were more likely to indicate that apprehension would depend on the circumstances, while participants who had not previously assaulted someone were more likely to indicate that they would be apprehended. This suggests that 'naive' participants who had not previously assaulted someone were more likely to perceive the risk of punishment as being high, and those more experienced participants were likely to perceive the risk of punishment as being low. The level of planning indicated is quite calculated, as the respondents clearly attempt to minimize their risk for punishment by preplanning the offence.

Break and Enter

When asked if they thought that they would be caught by the police if they did a break and enter, eight participants responded that they might or would be caught by the police (See

Table 17). Of these eight participants, seven participants volunteered that they had broken into at least one house or building in the past year, and six of these participants had been apprehended for committing a break and enter. Several of these participants recognized that if they did a break and enter, they would probably be caught, as they had been previously apprehended. One participant responded:

I already got caught. It's kind of hard to say no now.... I never thought, I thought I was invincible. I never thought it was possible to catch a smart criminal like me [laughs]. I guess I was wrong.

Table 17 - Certainty of Punishment and Experiential Effect (Break and Enter)*

	Committed break and enter and was apprehended	Committed break and enter and was not apprehended	Did not previously commit break and enter	Total
Likely to be apprehended	6 (30%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	8 (40%)
Not likely to be apprehended	5 (25%)	2 (10%)	3 (15%)	10 (50%)
Apprehension dependent upon circumstances/ planning	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	2 (10%)
Total	11 (55%)	4 (20%)	5 (25%)	20 (100%)

* Includes four break and enters that occurred more than one year ago.

Other participants indicated that according to the odds, sooner or later they would be caught by the police. This participant stated:

You could. There's a good chance on that too, you could get caught. They

don't catch, for just the people I know, they don't catch more than half of them.
Or they catch the wrong people.

Ten participants indicated that they would not be caught by the police if they did a break and enter. Seven of these respondents volunteered that they had committed break and enters in the past year, and five of the seven indicated that they had been previously apprehended. Most responded that they had either gotten away with break and enters in the past, or that the only reason that they had been caught was because someone 'ratted them out.' One participant responded:

Q - If you did a B & E, do you think that you would be caught by the police?

A - No.

Q - Why not?

A - Cause if I ever do a b&e it's gonna be planned. Which I probably won't ever do anyway, but I'd be cautious.

Q - I thought you'd done quite a few of them before?

A - I have. I used to do seven or eight b&e's a day.

Another participant did not believe that he would be apprehended, and replied:

I'm smarter than them. The only way I get caught is when people rat me out.

Participants were only slightly more likely to report that they would not be caught by the police if they committed a break and enter. However, those participants who reported that they would likely be apprehended tended to explain that they may be caught because they had previously committed a break and enter, and had been caught for that crime. Of those participants who reported that they did not feel that they would be apprehended, a large number also reported that they had previously been apprehended for committing a break and enter. However, in contrast, these participants tended to justify their response due to their history of 'getting away with it,' or because they felt that they were caught because of another person reporting their behaviour to the police. This experiential effect influences

perceptions about the risk of punishment, and may result in a deterrent effect for the newer or first-time offenders. The participants who reported that they would not be caught by the police also tended to indicate that they had committed multiple offences in the past, and would be able to prevent apprehension in the future by pre-planning the offence more carefully. These participants are less likely to be deterred, according to this sample.

In general, for robbery, assault, and, to a lesser degree, break and enter, participants were more likely to indicate that they would not be apprehended if they committed one of these criminal acts, or that they would plan the offence in order to minimize the risk of apprehension. These responses indicate that most participants perceive there to be a low level of certainty of apprehension and punishment for criminal behaviour. According to deterrence theory, a low level of certainty of apprehension or punishment will not serve as a deterrent to criminal behaviour, leaving these youth likely to commit future criminal acts upon release. In addition to the certainty of punishment, the participants were also questioned on their knowledge and perceptions about Project Turnaround.

Project Turnaround

In 1995, a provincial task force was appointed in order to make recommendations on implementing a strict discipline program, Project Turnaround, for the custody, management, and treatment of young offenders. As a result, the 'Encourage Youth Corporation' was contracted by the provincial government to create Project Turnaround. According to an overview provided by Project Turnaround, the following describes the behavioural management and advancement systems of the boot camp program:

Cadets at Project Turnaround are expected to advance through a four level behavioral [sic] management system. This system encompasses a daily point system and a performance guide manual. Each day cadets are graded on their daily activities that include the following categories: attitude, routines and chores, school and group attendance, dress and deportment etc. in [sic] order to advance to the next level a cadet must maintain a certain average for any 21 day period and he must accumulate a specified number of points. Example, level one cadets must reach 1260 total points and maintain and [sic] average of 60% for any 21 day period.

Tied directly into the point and level system is the performance guide. This document includes a subsection for each level. Cadets must complete a series of written. Oral [sic] assignments as well to demonstrate a mastery of certain tasks. Areas of concentration include; Drill and Ceremony, lifestyle and leadership, education, vocation, discharge planning and employment readiness. Once a cadet has completed the performance guide his work is reviewed along with his behavior [sic] and attitude and from this a recommendation is made for him to advance to the next level.

At Project Turnaround we believe that it is important to mark youths' advancement and achievements in symbolic ways. Formal ceremonies are held to recognize cadets' advancement and graduations. Youth are presented with tee-shirt, epaulets and certificates designating their rank and level (Project Turnaround, 1998).

Following the implementation of Project Turnaround, the provincial government released new 'Strict and Structured' guidelines in order to implement aspects of the strict discipline program into all correctional facilities for sixteen and seventeen year olds. Participants were further questioned on their knowledge of 'Project Turnaround,' and their perceptions of the provincial strict discipline program.

Have You Heard About the Program?

When asked if they had heard about the government opening up a boot camp called a strict discipline program for young offenders, seventeen participants responded that they had heard about the program. Various respondents indicated that they had heard that participants were forced to work out or exercise, that it was like the army where you have to get up early in the morning, and that cadets have to shave their heads. Several participants had friends who went to the camp, and two participants had heard about a recent break out from Project Turnaround. One participant responded:

I just heard that you've got to get up at like 7:30 in the morning, and run, and do pushups, and all kinds of crazy stuff, shave your head. I ain't going there, I'll tell you that.... I'll run from there.... If they don't think I can get away, test me [laughs]. I don't think boot camps are going to work. I think it's just going to piss people off more. Cause look when people come to jail they get real

pissed off.

Another participant described:

Q - Have you heard about the government opening up boot camps called a strict discipline program for young offenders?

A - Yeah, it ain't that strict.

Q - How do you know?

A - Cause my buddy broke out of boot camp. You ever heard of it, they stoled a van?

Q - Yeah. That was your buddy?

A - Yeah. Those were my friends.

Q - So it's not that strict?

A - Nah, it doesn't teach you nothing. It just gives you more for anger to go out into society and commit more crimes. Cause there were times when the staff pisses you off, you think oh, I know where that sucker lives [laughs].

Q - The staff?

A - Yeah. Or when you were up in West you know, like, yeah, call and say do me a favour, jump him in the parking lot.

Q - Does that happen very often?

A - Sometimes.

In order for punishment to have a deterrent effect, the potential offenders must first be aware of the existence of the punishment. Participants demonstrated an awareness of the recently opened strict discipline program. Knowledge of the program was spread primarily through word of mouth, from offender to offender throughout the system. Most offenders had been incarcerated in several facilities, and transfers were common.

Severity of Punishment

Deterrence theory predicts that the more severe the punishment, the greater the deterrent effect. Participants were questioned on their views of strict discipline programs in order to determine if the youth thought they were a good idea, how they would feel if they were sent to one, and if getting sent to a boot camp would cause any problems in their lives.

Do You Think that Boot Camps are a Good Idea?

When asked if they thought that boot camps are a good idea, seven participants indicated that they thought that boot camps are a good idea, with some qualifications. One participant responded:

I think they are good for discipline, might as well do something while you are sitting in jail. Get military training, self-esteem, self discipline.

Another participant stated:

Well if the government thinks they are a good idea, if they think that places like this are not working too well, or secure custody is not working too well, and all that, well if the government thinks it's alright it'll probably work.

This participant indicated:

It depends on the people working there. People who don't deserve to work there, like if they think they're like god, and they can make you do whatever they want you to do, I don't like them kind of people if they work there. I think people might actually like, if they go there, and they think it's cool, they might like be like, 'Yeah, this place is awesome, I want to go back.'

This participant reflected:

Well, in my opinion, the whole idea behind them, is, you know, to break down someone's frame of mind, because like, the way you're treated, with you know, the people that run it having so much authority over you, they can force you to do pretty much anything. And after a while it gets to you, and of course you're going to have issues, like where you freak out, and get mad and stuff, but then more severe repercussions are just placed upon you, that you can't do anything about. And after a while it gets through to the people and forces them to change.

Ten participants did not think that boot camp programs are a good idea. One

participant said:

They're going to piss people off. Boot camps and jails just make better criminals.

This participant indicated:

They're not. For one, they're not going to work. You get someone in there that's lazy, or has a bad, how do you say it, attitude. Yeah, has an attitude on them, getting waken up, especially like five or six whatever in the morning, that's not going to work. For one, I like getting at least a decent hour sleep before I wake up. And no one's going to wake me up at five or six in the morning. No, they're getting punched in the head. Running? Right when you get up? I don't think so.

Another participant stated:

No, it just gives kids more of a reason to break out. Cause, you stick me in there, I swear, I'll break out.... Or it'd give me more of a reason to come out and do more crime. But yeah, it'd be hard on the legs. Yeah, I could run much faster now [laughs].... Yeah, they ain't gonna catch me this time [laughs].

This participant indicated:

They just make you meaner, shit like that. Get AWOL, people get out ten times worse. It's like jail.

Another participant replied:

Just going to get out. The only thing that will help them get big for is the pen.

Several participants felt that a boot camp would be a positive experience with improved self-discipline, self-esteem, and physical fitness. However, most participants

responded that a boot camp would make the offenders more angry, and would result in the release of physically fit offenders ready to re-offend. Several participants who indicated that boot camps are not a good idea also indicated that they could not be forced to do things against their will, and that they might break out of the boot camp. This initial reaction is consistent with Sherman's (1993) defiance theory, whereby offending is increased as a result of the youth's defiant reaction to an imposed sanction. According to Sherman (1993), a defiant reaction is likely if the offender perceives the punishment to be unfair, is alienated from society, perceives the punishment as stigmatizing, and denies the shame associated with the imposition of a sanction.

Feelings on Being Sent to a Boot Camp

When asked how they would feel about being sent to a boot camp, thirteen respondents indicated that they either wouldn't like it, wouldn't want to go to a boot camp, or would be mad if they were sent to a boot camp. Five of those thirteen respondents indicated that they would go absent without leave (AWOL) from the boot camp if they were sent there. One participant described his reaction if he were sent to a boot camp:

Pissed off. I'd AWOL. I'd just keep running. I know if I AWOLed my boys would hide me.

This participant indicated:

I'd feel really angry, I'd probably try to hurt someone, but I wouldn't be there if I wasn't, if I didn't do crime, I wouldn't have to go to a place like that.

Another participant stated:

I probably wouldn't like it.... Cause I don't like rules that much. And I don't like people telling me what do to.

Six participants indicated that being sent to boot camp would not be much worse than being sent to jail. One participant indicated:

In a way I would dislike it, cause I can't take yelling, but in a way I would like it cause I would get more discipline, get training, come out with something earned.

Another participant responded:

Nothing I could do. No matter what, wherever you're at, you're being held against your will.

In spite of the fact that seven participants reported that they think that boot camps are a good idea, when questioned on how they would feel about being sent there, only three of these participants indicated that they would not mind being sent to a boot camp. The majority of participants indicated that they did not feel that boot camps were a good idea, and further indicated that they would not like being sent to a boot camp program. Participants further described that they thought a boot camp program would increase their feelings of anger, causing them to either attempt to break out of the boot camp, or to commit further criminal acts upon their release. Again, participants responded with a reaction consistent with defiance theory. This suggests that boot camps may increase the likelihood of future offending upon their release, rather than resulting in the intended reduction in crime through deterrence.

Would Getting Sent to Boot Camp Create Problems in your Life?

Deterrence theory predicts that those participants who perceive that a boot camp program would create problems in their lives would be more likely to be deterred from committing further offences, as the punishment is perceived to be severe. When asked if getting sent to a boot camp would create any problems in their lives, eleven participants responded that it would create problems in their lives. These participants were less

concerned about the severity of a boot camp, and more concerned about being separated from their family or friends. Six of those eleven respondents indicated that the distance from their home to the boot camp would prevent them from communicating with their family. One participant responded:

Yeah, I'd be away from my family, away from my friends, away from my girlfriend. I wouldn't be there long.... I'd run. If I don't like it somewhere I'm not gonna stay. The only reason why I'm sitting here is cause I like it.

When asked if getting sent to a boot camp would create any problems in his life, this participant responded:

I probably couldn't even handle it because I can't stand people yelling at me. I wouldn't last one day in there.

Another participant responded:

It'd probably make me more mad.... Especially if they are making me work out, I'll get bigger. And one day I might just, you know, turn around and start beating up people.

Five participants responded that getting sent to a boot camp would not create any problems in their lives. This participant did not think that getting sent to a boot camp would create any problems in his life:

Not really. Just make me stronger. If I were to go there for beating someone up, I'll come out two times bigger.

According to this participant:

Here it's just like a vacation here. You get everything. I don't know, I heard

that it's, there you don't get nothing. You just, you gotta say everything yes, you know, you gotta wake up in the morning, run, work out, eat, be on time, everything. It'd probably knock some sense into my head.

Another participant responded:

In my life, no because I've had so much experience with military programs. It's an environment that I enjoy, and that I do very well in. It's pretty much the only area of my life that I have a crystal clean record and haven't had any problems at all.

These participants, in focusing on the positive aspects of the boot camp program, may be less likely to be deterred by the threat of boot camp, as they perceive the severity of punishment as low. However, the participants who indicated that a boot camp program would create problems in their lives are also less likely to be deterred by the threat of a boot camp, as several participants indicated that forced participation in a boot camp program would increase their criminal activity upon release. Thus, both when participants indicate that a boot camp would cause problems, and when participants indicate that a boot camp would not cause problems, boot camps will not have a deterrent effect and may, in some cases, increase criminal behaviour.

Perceived Fairness of Punishment

The perception of the fairness of the punishment has been theorized to influence the offender's decision to commit an offence. Sherman (1993) proposes that the imposition of a substantively arbitrary, excessive, or undeserved punishment may increase the prevalence or seriousness of future offending through defiant reactions. Participants were interviewed in order to determine their perceptions surrounding the fairness of the imposition of a boot camp program as punishment for robbery, assault, and break and entering.

Would Boot Camp be a Fair Punishment for Robbery?

Five respondents indicated that getting sent to a boot camp for committing a robbery

would be a fair punishment. Several participants indicated that the punishment was well deserved for committing robbery. Of these five respondents, two later identified that they had committed a robbery in the past year. One participant indicated:

Why should you rob somebody? Anything would be a fair punishment for robbing somebody. Especially old people or something, that's ignorant.

Seven participants indicated that they did not think that getting sent to a boot camp for robbery would be a fair punishment. Three indicated that they had committed a robbery in the past year. One participant stated:

Q - Do you think that getting sent to boot camp for robbery would be a fair punishment?

A - No.

Q - Why not?

A - Because I think that put them in a program like this, doing the MRT and stuff, it helps you learn, and you get to talk about your crime with the staff here and stuff, and it helps you so you don't want to do crime no more.

Another participant replied:

No. I think you should go to the County jail.... I don't know, I'd run. I know there's ways out of there. You get up on a high enough level, you can go for walks, mile walks into the forest. They can get out those bounty dogs come flying. Run fast. Just jump a fence or get up in a tree and they can't do nothing.

Five participants were unable to answer definitively, saying that whether or not the punishment was fair depended on the circumstances. The circumstances cited included whether or not the robbery was an armed robbery, whether the offender was a repeat offender, whether the crime was violent, and on the length of the sentence. This participant said:

Depends on if it was your first offence or not. But if you're a repeat offender, probably. It's a good sentence.

The remaining two participants indicated that they did not know whether the sentence would be fair. One participant stated:

I'm not sure. Um, I'm not sure if it'd be fair or not. If you do the crime, then pay the time, you know, do the time but like boot camp, it's, pretty strict program. Maybe it would work you know. If I had a choice, I wouldn't want to go to boot camp.

Participants were more likely to indicate that being sentenced to a strict discipline program would be unfair, or that whether it was fair or not would depend on the circumstances of the crime. If one follows Sherman's argument, this perceived sense of unfairness over this type of punishment for robbery may result in defiant reactions on the part of the offenders. This defiance could lead to an increase in criminal behaviour rather than having a deterrent effect.

Would Boot Camp be a Fair Punishment for Assault?

Seven participants indicated that getting sent to a boot camp program for beating someone up would be a fair punishment. One participant indicated:

Yeah, it's a fair punishment. It's a strict program, like they think by sending someone to boot camp is gonna scare them or change them, but sending someone to boot camp isn't gonna change somebody. The only thing that might change somebody is the person, themselves.

In contrast, eight participants indicated that boot camp would not be a fair punishment for beating someone up. This participant responded:

No, I don't think so. Um, I don't know, it just doesn't seem proper getting sent to boot camp. Especially for like fighting, assaults. You're just going to get

him madder at the guy, he's getting sent to boot camp, he's going to be working out, he's going to be coming out bigger than he was when he went in.

Four participants indicated that whether the punishment was fair depended on how badly the person was beaten up, on whether it was your first offence, and on the length of the sentence. This participant indicated:

Q - Do you think that getting sent to boot camp for beating someone up is a fair punishment?

A - No. Depends on how bad, like if buddy can't walk, or whatever, like if you give him like a curby or something, but if you just punch him out.

Q - A curby?

A - Well you put their fucking face on the curb and then stomp [bangs hand on desk] on their heads and smash their teeth out, that'll probably do some damage. That's why it should be an eye for an eye. Like if you beat someone up, turn around and beat you up, eventually learn.

Another participant responded:

Depends if you really hurt him. If they were scarred for life or something.

Participants were as likely to respond that a strict discipline program was a fair punishment for committing an assault as they were to respond that it was not fair. Those participants who thought that a strict discipline program was a fair punishment for assault are less likely to react in a defiant manner for this offence. Those participants who indicated that a strict discipline program was not a fair punishment for assault are far more likely to react in a defiant manner in the future. Thus, there is no clear evidence that putting offenders in a boot camp for assault would lead to an overall positive effect.

Would Boot Camp be a Fair Punishment for Break and Enter?

Nine participants indicated that getting sent to boot camp for committing a break and enter would be a fair punishment. Several participants indicated that boot camp might

change their way of thinking. One participant replied:

Teach you not to do it, respect other people's property, learn not to go into other people's houses, not your place to be doing it. Breaking the law.

Another participant said:

Yeah, a fair punishment. It might change me, it might change my way of thinking, but the only thing that I don't like about boot camp is that you're always having somebody telling you what to do, always having somebody say, you know that you have to do what they want you to do, not the way that you want to be.

Eight participants indicated that getting sent to a boot camp for breaking into a house would not be a fair punishment. This participant indicated:

Q - Do you think that getting sent to the boot camp for breaking into a house is a fair punishment?

A - No. Because I think this program is a lot better than a boot camp program. They don't take like the time to know the kids. They just know you're a criminal.

Q - Do you consider yourself to be a criminal?

A - Uh, yeah. Well, I'm in here so, I'm a criminal right now because I'm in jail.

Two participants indicated that whether getting sent to a boot camp for committing a break and enter was fair would depend on whether you were a repeat offender, and on the length of sentence. Participants were slightly more likely to respond that a strict discipline program would be a fair punishment for committing a break and enter.

While responses were split, participants were slightly more likely to respond that boot camp would not be a fair punishment for robbery, slightly more likely to respond that boot camp would not be a fair punishment for assault, and slightly more likely to respond that boot camp would be a fair punishment for breaking and entering. To sum, responses varied on the sense of fairness of the imposition of a boot camp program as a punishment for

robbery, assault, and breaking and entering. According to Sherman's (1993) defiance theory, those participants who indicated that a boot camp program would be an unfair punishment are more likely to react in a defiant manner, thus decreasing the likelihood of a deterrent effect of a strict discipline program. In contrast, participants who indicated that the boot camp program would be a fair punishment may not necessarily react in a defiant manner. However, this does not automatically indicate that a deterrent effect may result, as participants indicate a tendency to calculate the risk of punishment prior to consideration of the fairness or severity of the punishment involved. If the punishment is perceived to be fair, and not overly severe, the threat of punishment may not present a deterrent effect.

Deterrent Effect of a Boot Camp

In addition to the certainty of apprehension, the stated deterrent effect of a boot camp program was also examined. Participants were questioned directly on whether they felt that the threat of a boot camp program would prevent them from committing robbery, assaults, and break and enters.

Would Boot Camp Stop You from Committing Robbery?

Four participants volunteered that the threat of getting sent to a boot camp would probably stop them from robbing someone. This participant replied:

I don't know, it'd just give me second thoughts. I'm not saying boot camp is nothing bad, I'm just saying I don't know nothing about it. Not really but, it'd just give me second thoughts. Once I heard that I'd think about it, I'd say to myself why would I want to get sent there.

Fourteen youth replied that the threat of boot camp would not prevent them from robbing someone. One participant stated:

No, but this, like, I'm still thinking about crime. I'm in jail and I'm still thinking about crime when I get out of here, what I can do.... I don't know if I'm going to follow through with it.

Another participant stated:

I don't give a shit. I don't care what people say. It goes in one ear and out the other.

Participants indicated that the threat of getting sent to a boot camp program would not prevent them from committing a robbery. The majority of participants indicated that if they felt like robbing someone, that they would do so, without regard for the threat of a possible punishment. According to the participants, the threat of a strict discipline program would not result in a deterrent effect on their future criminal behaviour.

Would Boot Camp Stop You from Committing Assaults?

When asked if the threat of being sent to a boot camp program would stop them from beating people up, only three participants indicated that threat would prevent them from beating someone up. One participant replied:

Q - If someone told you that you would be sent to a boot camp program if you beat someone up badly, would that stop you from doing it?

A - Probably.

Q - How come?

A - Cause I don't want to go there.

The remaining seventeen participants all indicated that if the person did something to deserve getting beaten up, then the threat of boot camp would not stop them from taking action. This participant replied:

I don't give a fuck. I have nothing to lose. All I have is my job to lose, but then I won't have to support myself when I'm sitting in boot camp. I wouldn't have to pay no rent or nothing.

Another participant indicated:

If the guy deserved the beating he's going to get it. Whatever the consequences I got, I'd take it.

Participants again indicated that their decision to act would not be influenced by the threat of punishment. It was clearly perceived that if another individual committed an offence against the participant that warranted a beating, then the participant would not be deterred by the threat of any type of punishment.

Would Boot Camp Stop You from Committing a Break and Enter?

Seven youth replied that the threat of boot camp would prevent them from breaking into houses. Four of these participants volunteered that they had not committed a break and enter in the past year. One participant indicated:

I wouldn't want to get sent there. I don't think I'm gonna do any more b&e's when I get out.

Another participant responded:

I'm trying to get out of the criminal life. I've been out, but I think it's just my anger. Lose my temper really quick.

Thirteen participants stated that the threat of being sent to a boot camp program would not stop them from doing break and enters. Eight of these thirteen participants volunteered that they had committed at least one break and enter in the past year. Several indicated that they had not yet been caught for committing break and enter in the past, so the threat of boot camp did not bother them. One participant stated:

I wouldn't get caught. I've never been caught before for a b&e.

Another participant stated:

I know they won't catch me. Cause the cops are stupid. They are. Seriously, they're stupid. They think they're smart, they think they know what's going on, but they don't. Or they'd have put me behind bars a long time ago.

Other participants indicated that if they decided that they wanted to break into a house, the threat of punishment would not stop them from doing so. According to one participant:

If I need money, I'm going to get it, no matter how.

While the threat of boot camp was slightly more effective for break and enter, participants were still more likely to report that the threat of a strict discipline program would not deter them from committing a break and enter. Several participants indicated that they were not planning on committing further break and enters upon their release from custody; however, this response could likely be attributed to their experience within the open custody facility, rather than the threat of the punishment of a strict discipline program.

When directly asked if the threat of a boot camp program would deter them from committing robbery, assault, and break and enter, participants reported that the threat of punishment would not deter them from committing further offences. The majority of participants indicated that if they felt like committing an offence, that they would do so, without regard for the threat of a possible punishment. While allowing for the possibility of the actual boot camp experience to serve as a specific deterrent, it is evident that these youth do not consider the threat of this sanction to be certain or severe enough to prevent their offending behaviour. Further, these youth are likely to react in a defiant manner, thus decreasing the likelihood of a deterrent effect of a strict discipline program.

Program Recommendations

In order to determine what type of punishment or program would prevent youth from committing criminal acts, participants were encouraged to provide input. This question was raised in order to encourage input from those directly affected by the imposition of a program meant to deter young offenders. Participants were asked to design a program to keep kids from committing crime. Five participants acknowledged that the program should resemble the open custody facility in which they currently were incarcerated, with some modifications. Eight other participants responded with particular components of the open custody facility. This participant described:

Well, a place like this, once a week, you get a day off, where you can go home, and do MRT. Weight training, anger management, drug management.... Good food.

Another participant indicated that residents should be allowed to go to an outside school, and that the current House lacked gym facilities and other activities. He stated:

I think it would be somewhat like this. With more skills, more rules, make the school harder. Like send them to a normal school, because a lot of people don't like not going to a normal school. Have a clean big place, get activities to keep the kids busy. Here we just play ping pong and watch tv. We need a gym to keep busy.

Several participants indicated that the program should be located in close proximity to the residents' family, and several participants also indicated that the resident should be able to attend school.

Two participants identified money as a core cause of delinquency. One participant recommended that a program concentrate on finding jobs for youth:

Well if the kids had more money, families, I don't think they'd be doing crime. People don't do crime just for the fun of it. People do it cause they need the money. Well most people anyway. So I'd probably, I think tell them where

they could get jobs, help.

Two participants indicated that the program should be a combination of features of a boot camp and a secure custody facility. Two others indicated that the program should be tough in order to reduce crime. One participant stated:

It'd be just like boot camp. But there'd be no privileges. Just like a normal penitentiary, maybe just like one of those no privileges, to teach them a lesson. And there would be like no levels, like they got here. And bed-time would be like eight o'clock, nine o'clock. Go to school, get an education, if they get out of line, ground them. That's about it. Just keeping them home.

One participant indicated that the program should have a 'scared straight' component:

Oh, it'd be like torture, torture them to stay away from crime. Or make them stay with adults who have been in for like twenty years, or twenty five years, in the same cell.... I'd put them in with like low low low class criminals, like I'd put em in with like paedophiles, and all that kind of people.... They'd see these people, and would never want to go back, cause they'd know that they'd have to do time again.

Participants appear to favour the structure of open custody facilities as currently operated. Participants expressed concern about the proximity of facilities, and clearly preferred incarceration relatively close in location to their family. Participants also identified the lack of money as a cause of delinquency. Only a small number of participants actually indicated that they felt that the punishment imposed should be more severe than currently structured at an open custody facility.

To summarize formal social control, deterrence theory predicts that the deterrent ability of formal sanctions is dependent upon the offender's perceptions of the certainty, severity, and celerity of punishment. The offender is presumed to rationally weigh the possibility of apprehension, along with the likelihood and severity of punishment if apprehended, with the expected benefits or rewards of the illegal behaviour. Accordingly,

the application of formal sanctions was analysed, including experience within the criminal justice system, certainty of apprehension, knowledge and perceptions of a strict discipline program, probability of deterrence, and the perceived fairness of punishment.

Participants reported having experienced extensive contact with the criminal justice system. Participants described frequent negative contact, along with a marked lack of respect toward the police. The youth perceive themselves as being unfairly targeted or harassed by the police, which may result in defiant reactions on the part of the offenders. In addition, participants also described varying degrees of experience both in the courtroom and at custodial facilities. Inexperienced or 'naive' offenders were more likely to have negative experiences in court, and adjusted poorly to the custodial facility. In contrast, the more experienced offenders appeared to demonstrate an experiential effect, decreasing the impact or seriousness of the formal sanction. This may also explain the youths' lack of respect toward the police, as repeated negative past contact may have diminished the impact of continued or future contact.

Participants were also questioned on their perceptions of the certainty of apprehension. In general, participants indicated that they were not likely to be apprehended if they committed certain offences, or that they would plan the circumstances of the offence in such a manner as to minimize their risk of apprehension. A deterrent theory model might predict that this perceived low risk of apprehension reduces or nullifies the impact that the threat of punishment may have on reducing offending behaviour.

Participants were queried on their awareness of the existence of a strict discipline program, and also on their views of the program in order to determine if they felt that boot camps were a good idea, how they would feel if they were sent to a boot camp, and if getting sent to a boot camp would cause any problems in their lives. In part due to networking among the young offender population, the majority of participants were aware of the implementation of a boot camp program. Most participants reported that they did not feel that boot camps are a good idea, and the majority of participants indicated that they would not like to be sent to a boot camp. Participants objected to the perceived authoritarian environment, along with the forced physical activity and separation from family and home

due to the distant location of the facility. The participants who responded that they would not like to be sent to a boot camp may consider the punishment high in severity. However, rather than be deterred from criminal activity, most of these participants responded in a defiant manner, indicating that if they were sent to a boot camp against their will, many would attempt to break out of the facility, or would graduate from the facility more capable of committing future crimes. Thus, rather than a deterrent effect, boot camp may have the opposite effect, increasing criminal behaviour on the part of these youth.

Finally, participants were questioned directly on whether the threat of being sent to a boot camp would prevent them from committing robbery, assault, or break and enter. In all three instances, participants indicated that if they felt like committing an offence, that the threat of a possible punishment would not deter them.

Chapter 5.

Conclusion

'Five years' time? It's hard to say. I'm not thinking about five years from now. I'm just thinking about one day at a time. Like I hope, I hope that I'm not doing crime, maybe a family or something. Maybe be in a good relationship, have a good relationship with a girl, hopefully have a good paying job, maybe own my own house, something.... I want to try to get my criminal record cleared.'

(Participant's response to questioning on what he would be doing in five years' time.)

Overview

Informal and formal social control theories were examined in order to explore young offenders' perceptions on the threat of punishment as a deterrent to criminal activity. Twenty male young offenders, incarcerated in an open custody facility, were interviewed using an interview schedule grounded in the deterrence literature. Issues of informal social control were informed by Hirschi's (1969) social bonding theory, which argues that individuals become free to commit crimes when their ties to society are broken or diminished. In addition to informal social control theory, deterrence theory was also examined in relation to more formal methods of controlling behaviour. Deterrence theory is based on early classical theory's premise of rationality — offenders weigh the benefits of a criminal act with the risks associated with arrest and punishment. Sherman's (1993) defiance theory was also considered, as offenders frequently react in defiance as a result of

the imposition of social controls.

Summary of Findings

Informal Social Control

Participants were questioned on their informal sources of social control, including their history of education, previous employment, peer groups, and family relations.

School

It was determined that, while the youth were mandated to attend school during their incarceration, the majority had been suspended, expelled, or had dropped out of school prior to their incarceration. Those participants who had been attending school prior to their incarceration indicated that they had not been performing well academically, and cited numerous distractions, including drug and alcohol abuse.

However, the school at the residential facility operated differently from a conventional community-based school. In spite of problems experienced within community-based schools, once attending school at the House, most participants indicated that they were concerned about their academic performance. Further, participants also expressed a desire to continue their schooling following their incarceration, to graduate, and to later find employment. Thus, participants appeared to enjoy an increased level of academic success while attending the residential school.

These findings suggest the existence of a newly created bond to the educational system, a bond that may serve to inhibit criminal activity upon release. Indications of an increased level of academic performance suggest that, upon release, criminal behaviour will be reduced. As Hirschi (1969) argues, the better a student does in school, the less likely he is to commit delinquent acts, and the less likely he is to be picked up by the police. This success may be attributed to the mandatory attendance at the residential school, lower student/teacher ratios, an individualized curriculum, the focus on a single credit at one time, and fewer distractions present at the in-house school. However, assuming that these youth

carry through with their intentions to return to the conventional school system upon their release, positive effects created in the open custody facility may be undermined. Successful community reintegration may be contingent upon the quality of education provided within the community based school.

Employment

In addition to their education, participants were also questioned on their history of employment. Clearly, these youth demonstrated a work ethic consistent with conventional society. When questioned, participants envisioned a future that included conventional employment. Most participants reported that they had already been employed in a labour intensive field, and reported positive attachment toward the employment. Further, participants were asked to describe their preferred employment. A large number of participants responded with skilled or professional occupations, which would be unattainable for these youth without, at a minimum, the acquirement of a high school degree. While it could be theorized that these aspirations may lead to strain, these youth were realistic in their understanding of the contrast between a preferred career, and their likely future employment.

Nevertheless, the bond to employment may be vital in reducing or eliminating these youths' future criminal behaviour. Social bonding theory predicts that those employed are at lower risk for criminal behaviour, as their stake in conformity is higher. Most participants indicated a history of previous employment, and further demonstrated an attachment to employment. With the appropriate educational requirements and job seeking skills, it is possible for these youth to further strengthen these bonds to the labour market in the future, increasing the stakes of involvement in criminal behaviour, and thereby decreasing the likelihood of criminal activity.

Attachment to Significant Others

In addition to education and employment, the family is also considered as an informal source of control. The familial history of the participants was relatively unstable. Only two

participants indicated that they lived with both their natural mother and father prior to their incarceration, and most came from lower class backgrounds. As lower class youth have a lower stake in conformity than middle class youth, they are less likely to be deterred by the threat of punishment. Participants also reported relatively unstable living arrangements, with frequent moves from the residence of one family member to another. In spite of this, participants reported strong attachments to their families, in particular to their mothers. Participants were less likely to report a strong relationship with their fathers. Social control theory might predict that this bond reduces the likelihood of criminal activity; however, it is likely that the influence of this attachment is decreased, as participants did not have stable living arrangements with their parents. Participants were quick to claim that their parents did not control their decision making or their behaviour. This lack of parental influence leaves these youths at risk for future criminal behaviour.

Peers

The influence of the peer group also affects the youth's decision making. According to social bonding theory, the greater the emotional and psychological attachment that these youth have to their friends, the less likely they are to commit criminal behaviour. Participants who reported smaller peer groups were most likely to indicate that they cared about what their friends thought of them. These participants appeared to have a strong attachment to their peers. Conversely, participants who reported having larger peer groups were more likely to indicate that they did not care what their friends thought of them. This latter group of participants appear to be poorly attached to their peers; consequently, social control theory would predict that they are at higher risk for criminal behaviour.

While participants indicated the presence of friends who disapproved of law breaking behaviour, these peers were undeniably in the minority, and contact with these friends was infrequent. Hence, despite the fact that participants reported that they had friends who disapproved of their law breaking behaviour, participants did not indicate a significant attachment toward these peers. Respondents also indicated that although most of their friends break the law, their peers did not pressure them to break the law. This is consistent

with Hirschi's claim that delinquent youth choose other delinquent youth to form a peer group, rather than influencing non-offenders to commit offences. These peers are unlikely to serve as an informal source of control.

Morality

School, employment, family relations, and peer interaction were all examined as sources of informal social control. These informal controls impact upon the socialization process of the offenders, and impact upon the internalization of norms and values. The participants' perceptions of morality were examined in order to determine whether the youth felt that it was wrong to break the law, and whether this would influence their behaviour. Despite the fact that the participants have all broken the law, they also report having internalized a conventional belief system. Although almost all of the participants agreed that, in general, it is wrong to break the law, this did not prevent them from committing certain offences.

Belief systems were examined in relation to robbery, assault, and break and entering. Participants indicated that they believe that it is wrong to rob someone or break into a house. In contrast, most participants did not feel that it is wrong to badly assault another person. Instead, participants tended to justify assaultive behaviour based on their perceptions of whether the individual deserved the beating. However, participants did concede that it is wrong to assault an innocent person for no reason.

Participants justified their history of violating these norms using techniques of neutralization. Sykes and Matza (1957) propose that offenders become 'free' to act delinquent by neutralizing or suspending their commitment to social values. Although these youth have indicated an understanding of the inherent 'wrongness' of breaking the law, it is questionable whether they have in fact internalized the norm, and whether this knowledge will prevent them from justifying future offences. It appears that the informal social controls present in the lives of these youth are probably not effective in influencing these offenders' behaviour.

To summarize informal social control, these participants appear to have developed

a bond to the educational system while attending the in-house school, which may serve as a source of control. However, the community-based educational system, as currently structured, may not provide adequate support to these youth upon their release. Additionally, these youth appear to have formed an attachment to the labour market, which indicates a bond to conventional society. However, familial relations do not appear to serve as a source of control, in spite of the fact that these youth have indicated strong attachments to their families. Reduced contact or influence of family members, in part due to instable living arrangements, appears to decrease the effectiveness of the attachment as a social control. For peer groups, participants who reported smaller peer groups were most likely to be attached to their peers. However, for those participants not attached to their peers, peer relationships do not serve as a source of control, and fail to influence the behaviour of the participants. As well, while the youth voiced confirmation of understanding the immorality or inherent 'wrongness' of breaking the law, they rationalize law breaking behaviour, leaving them less likely to be deterred.

Formal Social Control

The informal social controls generally prevalent in the lives of these young people fail to effectively influence criminal behaviour. Consequently, formal social control mechanisms are left with the task of deterring potential offenders from criminal behaviour, through either the threat of the imposition of punishment, or through direct experience with the formal sanction. More formally instituted methods of social control were evaluated, including previous police contact, experience within the court system, custodial experience, certainty of punishment, knowledge and perceptions of a strict discipline program, probability of deterrence, and perceived fairness of punishment. Taken from a rational choice model, deterrence theory presumes that potential offenders weigh the possibility of apprehension, along with the likelihood and severity of punishment if apprehended, with the expected benefits or rewards of the illegal behaviour. The application of formal sanctions was examined, including contact with the police, experience within the criminal justice system, and the threat of punishment.

Relations with Police

Participants described extensive previous contact with the police, often starting at an early age. While some participants recognized that the police were just doing their job, most participants expressed intense dislike toward the police, usually based on their own previous negative experiences with the police. This lack of respect toward the police is unlikely to result in a deterrent effect through fear of contact with the police. Rather, it is likely to result in a defiant reaction on the part of the young offender, based on perceptions of discriminatory enforcement on the part of the police, and may actually serve to increase criminal behaviour.

Experience within the Criminal Justice System

In addition to the formality of contact with the police, exposure to the criminal justice system was also examined. Deterrence theory posits that a swift and severe punishment administered by the criminal justice system would serve to reduce future criminal behaviour. Participants were asked to describe their courtroom experiences. Several participants reported negative reactions to their courtroom exposure; however, these participants tended to be more inexperienced offenders. The more experienced participants revealed that their exposure to the court system had been frequent, and that this exposure had been characterized by multiple remands. These offenders tended to be relatively nonchalant in describing their courtroom experiences. For the 'naive' offenders who reported negative experiences in court, the actual courtroom experience may serve as a deterrent. However, the more experienced offenders are not likely to be influenced or deterred by continued experience within the court system.

In addition to the court appearance, previous custodial experiences were also considered. Respondents described custodial histories ranging from detention centres, open custody facilities, and secure custody facilities. It was determined that the majority of participants reported an extensive history of custodial facilities, and tended to adjust well to the open custody facility where the research was conducted. Conversely, the few participants who reported negative experiences while staying at the facility indicated that

their exposure to custodial facilities had been limited. Clearly, the majority of participants do not perceive the experience in this open custody facility to be exceptionally harsh. In fact, most participants commented positively on the benefits of the programming available to them while at the facility. Again, the more experienced offenders tended to adjust well to the facility, indicating that they did not consider the punishment to be unduly harsh. However, the more inexperienced offenders were more likely to undergo difficulties while residing at the facility, indicating a more severe experience on the part of the 'naive' offenders. The few participants who did respond negatively to their experiences at the facility may react defiantly, elevating their risk of future criminal behaviour both while in custody, and upon release. For the majority of participants, the open custody facility has contributed to their attempted rehabilitation; however, this effect may be undermined upon release.

Certainty of Punishment

Deterrence theory also predicts that the greater the certainty of apprehension and punishment, the greater the ability to deter. Participants were questioned on the likelihood of apprehension if they committed a robbery, an assault, and a break and enter. In general, most participants perceive there to be a low likelihood of apprehension, or that they would be able to plan the offence in order to minimize the risk of apprehension in the future. Further, an experiential effect was found. Participants who had been previously apprehended for committing an offence were more likely to perceive apprehension in the future as likely. The only exception was for assault, for which participants reported that apprehension may depend on external factors, such as whether the person assaulted could recognize the offender. Participants who had been previously apprehended, but indicated that future apprehension was not likely, tended to report that their previous apprehension had been due to external factors, or that they had committed many more offences in the past unapprehended. Participants who reported that they had previously committed offences unapprehended were most likely to perceive the certainty of punishment as low, or that the certainty of punishment would depend on the planning or the circumstances of the offence.

The participants who indicated that they had not previously committed the offence in question varied in regards to certainty — some felt that apprehension was likely, and others felt that apprehension was not likely, or that it depended upon the circumstances of the offence. This experiential effect influences perceptions about the risk of punishment, and may result in a deterrent effect for the first-time offenders. However, the participants who perceive the risk of apprehension to be low because they had ‘gotten away with’ multiple offences in the past, or that they would be able to plan further offences to prevent apprehension, are less likely to be deterred by the threat of punishment. However, in general, most participants perceive there to be a low likelihood of apprehension, or that they would be able to plan the offence in order to minimize the risk of apprehension in the future.

Project Turnaround

In addition to certainty, knowledge and perceptions of ‘Project Turnaround’ were also evaluated. In order for the imposition of a strict discipline program to have a deterrent effect, the potential cadets of the program must be aware of its existence. Most of the young offenders participating in this research reported that they had heard about the program. The perceptions of the young offenders were relatively accurate. Knowledge about the program was spread primarily by word of mouth throughout the offenders within the province. As most young offenders had been previously incarcerated, and transfers from facility to facility were common, an intricate communication network exists within the young offender community throughout the province.

Severity of Punishment

Participants were questioned on their views about the strict discipline program in order to determine if they thought that boot camps are a good idea, how they would feel if they were sent to one, and if getting sent to a boot camp would cause any problem in their lives. Several participants felt that the experience of a boot camp would improve self-discipline, self-esteem, and physical fitness. However, a larger number of participants responded that a boot camp would make the offenders more angry, and would result in the

release of physically fit offenders ready to re-offend. Participants also reported that they would not like being sent to a boot camp, and would be angry if they were sent there. Several participants reported that they would attempt to break out of the facility if they were sent there against their will.

An application of deterrence theory would predict that participants who perceive that a boot camp would create problems in their lives would be more likely to be deterred from committing offences. A large number of participants indicated that incarceration in a boot camp would create problems in their lives. However, participants were more concerned with the location of the boot camp than they were about its severity, citing concern for the possible separation from their family. These participants are not likely to be deterred from criminal activity by the threat of boot camp; in fact, most indicated that they might react criminally if they were forced to attend a boot camp. However, several participants did report that getting sent to a boot camp would not create any problems in their lives. On examination, these participants are also not likely to be deterred by the threat of a boot camp, as the perceived severity of the punishment is low. The threat of incarceration in a strict discipline program is unlikely to result in a deterrent effect, and may actually serve to increase criminal behaviour.

Perceived Fairness of Punishment

It has also been suggested that the offender's perception of the fairness of punishment would influence criminal behaviour. Respondents were questioned on their perceptions of the fairness of the imposition of a boot camp program as punishment. To sum, responses varied on the sense of fairness for the imposition of a boot camp program as punishment for robbery, assault, and breaking and entering. While responses were split, participants were slightly more likely to respond that a boot camp would not be a fair punishment for robbery or assault, and slightly more likely to respond that a boot camp would be a fair punishment for breaking and entering. According to defiance theory, participants who felt that the imposition of a boot camp program as punishment would be unfair are likely to react in a defiant manner, thus decreasing the likelihood of a deterrent effect of a strict discipline

program. However, the perceived fairness of the punishment may not affect the deterrent ability of the punishment, as participants tended to calculate the risk of punishment rather than the fairness or severity of punishment. Fairness might come into play once the offender has experienced the strict discipline program personally, as participants indicated that they might react defiantly either while incarcerated (by disobeying rules or attempting to break out), or upon their release.

Deterrent Effect of a Boot Camp

Participants were questioned directly on whether they felt that the threat of a boot camp program would prevent them from committing certain offences. Participants reported that the threat of a boot camp program would not deter them from committing robbery, assault or break and entering. While the threat of a boot camp program was slightly more effective for break and enter, participants were still more likely to report that if they had a reason to commit an offence, the threat of punishment would not prevent them from doing so. Thus, according to the stated responses of these youth, the threat of punishment is unlikely to prevent them from offending.

To summarize formal methods of control, extensive previous police contact has resulted in a lack of respect toward law enforcement officers, and may increase criminal behaviour as a result of defiant reactions on the part of the offenders. Exposure to the criminal justice system may serve as a deterrent to 'naive' offenders who consider their courtroom experience to be negative; however, as criminal proceedings are delayed by numerous remands, offenders become increasingly nonchalant about the experience, indicating a diminished impact of the formal process. Similarly, 'naive' or first-time offenders tended to perceive incarceration as more severe, while the more experienced offenders tended to adjust to custody. The majority of participants indicated that the open custody facility contributed positively to their rehabilitation. Formal sanctions examined included the offenders' perceptions of the certainty of punishment. In general, offenders perceived the likelihood of apprehension to be low. An experiential effect was also found, which may indicate that first-time offenders are most likely to be deterred. However,

participants who perceived the risk of apprehension to be low because they would plan future offences in order to prevent apprehension, or because they had committed numerous offences unapprehended in the past are less likely to be deterred by the threat of punishment. In addition, participants are not likely to be deterred by the threat of a boot camp, as the perceived severity of the punishment is low.

In conclusion, sources of informal social control and more formal methods of control were examined in order to evaluate their effectiveness in deterring offenders from criminal activity. Informal sources of control included the participants' involvement in the educational system, previous employment, family relations, peer groups, and the internalization of norms and values. These informal sources are unable to effectively influence the behaviour of these youth, although they may be somewhat effective in the future. Consequently, formal social control mechanisms are left with the task of deterring potential offenders from criminal behaviour, either through the threat of punishment, or through direct experience with the formal sanction. Formal methods of control included previous police contact, experience within the criminal justice system, certainty of punishment, knowledge and perceptions of a strict discipline program, probable deterrence, and perceived fairness. It would appear that formal sanctions are even more ineffective in deterring young offenders from future offences, and may actually produce increased criminal behaviour as a result of defiant reactions.

Recommendations

These findings suggest that informal and formal methods of social control, as they now operate, appear to be ineffective in controlling the behaviour of these youth. However, this data offers potentially promising solutions. First, in light of the findings on school, priority should be placed on encouraging or mandating these youth to remain enrolled in the educational system upon their discharge from the facility. The educational system in which they participate must be tailored to suit the needs of these youth, including mandatory attendance, lower student/teacher ratios, an individualized curriculum, a single credit focus, and fewer distractions present, as found at the in-house school. This will create a strong

bond and act as an informal control against criminal behaviour.

The findings were also generally positive concerning employment. These youth indicated a positive attachment toward employment, and efforts should be made to assist these youth in realizing their goals upon release. Employment counselling, along with resume writing and interview skill building techniques should be incorporated into the education and training of these youth. Further, they should be assisted in obtaining rewarding employment with opportunities for career advancement. Again, good employment can create a bond that might inhibit criminal behaviour.

In addition, family and peer groups must be considered in any rehabilitation attempts. These offenders have indicated that family relations are extremely important to them, and that their families care about their behaviour. Where ever possible, young offenders should be incarcerated in an institution in close proximity to their family members, and the family should be included in rehabilitation programming. However, as these youth are struggling to assert their independence, reintegration back into the familial residence may not always be the optimal choice. While rehabilitation attempts should include family where ever possible, in some instances the youth may benefit from a stable residence without the suddenly renewed presence of a parental authority figure.

Participants reporting smaller peer groups indicated a strong attachment to their friends, and participants reporting larger peer groups indicated a weak attachment. Regardless of the strength of the attachment, participants indicated that their peer group was primarily comprised of delinquent youth. Despite Hirschi's assertion that attachment to peers fosters conformity, most researchers have found a positive correlation between delinquent peers and delinquent behaviour (Brownfield and Thompson, 1995: 182). Regardless, an effort should be made to distance youth from peers who continue to commit offences. Efforts should be made to encourage youth attempting rehabilitation to form attachments with similar youth, and to renew or strengthen acquaintances with non-offending peers.

The prevalence of substance abuse in the lives of these youth indicates a need for drug and alcohol abuse treatment programming, which should be instituted or strengthened within

both the in-house and community-based school system. As these youth appear to be abusing substances to deal with problems in their lives (academic difficulties, family conflicts, and the incarceration of family members), family counselling is also necessary. In addition, participants indicated support for the programming and counselling available at the open custody facility; consequently, continued programming upon release would be beneficial. Grief counselling may also assist these youth in dealing with the death of family members.

In terms of morality, participants demonstrated a strong awareness of conventional norms and values. While this may be influenced by the Moral Reconnection Therapy (MRT) program administered at the custodial facility, participants demonstrated only a superficial awareness of the victimization caused by offending behaviour. Participants tended to justify criminal behaviour, minimizing the extent of victimization. Programming in coalition with victim services organizations may help to address this need. Presentations and personal interaction with victim services staff, possibly in conjunction with victims willing to participate, may strengthen the offenders' understanding of the effects of victimization.

Reported contact with police has consisted primarily of negative or perceived 'harassment.' This has produced a general lack of respect, both towards the law enforcement officers, and the law. Contact consisting of a more positive nature, possibly both within the open custody facility and upon release, may increase the youths' respect for the law. Proactive policing, along with a more community-based model, might be more effective than the current attempt to control behaviour through fear of contact.

While the criminal justice system may be intimidating for inexperienced or first-time offenders, offenders do not remain 'naive' for an extended period of time. Once the offenders become accustomed to court proceedings and custodial facilities, the impact or formality of the system decreases in perceived seriousness. Where ever possible, especially for non-violent offenders, alternative measures should be employed. At the discretion of the police, offenders should be directed toward alternative measures prior to contact with the criminal justice system. Half of the participants interviewed for this research cited property offences, drug offences, and breach of probation as causes for their incarceration. These offenders could be effectively dealt with through alternative measures, a few of which might

include restitution, counselling, and substance abuse programming.

As participants report that the threat of punishment does not deter them from criminal behaviour, incarceration should not be viewed as a panacea to youth crime, or crime in general. Rather, incarceration should be reserved for the most serious offenders, and utilized to protect the public from harm. If punitive sanctions are ineffective in deterring offenders from crime, alternative methods should be implemented to specifically target this at-risk population. While it is possible that the threat of these types of sanctions may be an effective means of social control or deterrence for the majority of non-offenders, the offender population needs to be considered within a specialized framework.

The appropriateness of the continued punitive response in dealing with young offenders, in spite of the 'what works' debate in criminological research, must be questioned. The public perceives that rates of crime, especially youth crime, are rising; however, in fact, the youth crime rate in Canada is decreasing. In spite of this, and in part due to media sensationalism, public opinion has been capitalized upon by the right-wing anti-crime election platforms of the provincial government (PC's stake out crime as issue, 1999; Crime fears give Conservatives a 'wedge,' 1999). As the fears of the public are not grounded in fact, a responsible government reaction would be to inform the public of this erroneous perception.

The provincial trend towards harsher punishments for young offenders, including the recent implementation of a strict discipline program, continues despite the fact that research indicates that the recidivism rates of shock incarceration graduates, paroled inmates, and probationers are similar (Shaw and MacKenzie, 1992). Rather than targeting resources toward more effective sources of informal control such as preventative and alternative measures, public policy continues to fund formal sanctions such as incarceration and strict discipline programs. If harsher punishments do not deter offenders from criminal behaviour, one must question whether the purpose of the punishment is an attempt to deter, or whether the punishment is meted out in retribution. A truly just criminal justice system should attempt to prevent future offences, and aid in rehabilitation and restitution, rather than focus on punishment.

new. beginnings (essex county)

December 4, 1997

Dr. Alan Hall
Chair of the Ethics and
Research Committee
Dept. of Sociology and Anthropology
University of Windsor
401 Sunset Avenue
Windsor, Ontario
N9B 3P4

Dear Dr. Hall,

I am writing in response to the November 4, 1997 letter I received from Ms. Jill Johns. Ms. Johns also submitted to me a summary of the research she is proposing to conduct at New Beginnings. I find her topic to be very valid given the current political climate and I am sure that the results of her research will be of great interest to my agency.

I have thoroughly reviewed the summary of the research proposal and the questionnaire which Ms. Johns is proposing to use. I believe all of the questions are appropriate and I believe that the issues of confidentiality and consent will be adequately addressed. I whole-heartedly support Ms. Johns request and I will be more than happy to accommodate her at her earliest convenience in order for her to begin her work.

Should you have any questions or comments please contact me at your convenience.

Sincerely,



Biagio (Bill) Marra
Executive Director

Business Office
Butch Collins Residence
Neil Libby Residence

1049 Janette Ave., Windsor, Ont. N9A 5A4 • Phone 971-9000 • Fax 971-9002
1049 Janette Ave., Windsor, Ont. N9A 5A4 • Phone 971-9000 • Fax 971-9002
866 Rossini Blvd., Windsor, Ont. N8Y 2Z3 • Phone 944-5660 • Fax 945-0535

Appendix 2 - Informed Consent Form

This study will be conducted by Jill Johns, a graduate student in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, at the University of Windsor. The faculty advisor to the project is Dr. Stephen Baron. This research has been approved by the Department of Sociology and Anthropology Ethics Committee.

The purpose of this study is to explore the effectiveness of the threat of punishment in deterring young offenders from criminal activity. This interview should take one half hour to complete. I will be interviewing youth residing at _____ in order to find out what you think about crime and punishment. I will be interviewing you about your personal involvement in criminal behaviour.

Your participation in the interview is completely voluntary. You may refuse to answer any questions which you feel are too sensitive, personal or awkward, without any need on your part for explanation. You may feel free to withdraw from the study at any time. With your permission, a tape recorder will be used to record the session. All information obtained in the course of the interview will remain confidential. You will not be identified in any way after the interview, in either written or oral form. Participants in this study will receive \$10.00 in coupons.

The findings of this study will be available to you at the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, University of Windsor. You may contact me at (519) 253-4232 (ext. 2191) should you require additional information. If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please contact Dr. Alan Hall, Chair of the Ethics Committee, the Department of Sociology and Anthropology (519) 253-4232.

I, _____, understand the information given above and voluntarily consent to participate in this research.

Signature

Date

Appendix 3 - Interview Schedule

How old are you?

Are you going to school?

Do/did you like school? Why/Why not? Do/did you care how well you do in school?

Do you have a job? What do you do? When you last had a job, what did you do?

Do/did you like your job? Do/did you want to work there or buy time?

What kind of job would you like to have?

Who were you living with before you came to the House?

Do you have any contact with your parents now that you're at the House? If not your parents, then who else are you in touch with?

Do your parents work? What do they do?

Do/did you get along with your parents when you were living with them?

Do your parents care that you have broken the law? What do they think or say?

How would you describe your relationship with your parents?

Tell me about other people who might care about you and what you do.

Do these people care that you have broken the law? What do they think or say?

Do you care what your friends think of you?

Of the people that you hang around with, how many break the law?

Do you ever feel pressure from your friends to break the law?

Do you have friends who would disapprove of you breaking the law?

Can you describe a typical day for you before coming to the House?

What do you and your friends do for fun?

How many close friends do you have?

Can you tell me about how you came to be at the House? How long have you been here?

What do you think of it?

Have you ever been in custody somewhere else? What was that like?

How wrong do you think it is to break the law?

Do you think it is wrong to rob someone?

How about beating someone up so bad that they had to be hospitalized? Do you think that is wrong?

What about breaking into a house? Do you think that is wrong?

Have you heard about the government opening up boot camps called a strict discipline program for young offenders? What have you heard about it? Do you think they are a good idea?

Would getting sent there create any problems in your life?

How would you feel about being sent to a boot camp?

If you robbed someone, do you think that you would be caught by the police?

If someone told you that you would be sent to this boot camp if you robbed someone, would that stop you?

Do you think that getting sent there for robbery would be a fair punishment?

If you were to beat someone up really bad, do you think that you would be caught by the police?

If someone told you that you would be sent to a boot camp program if you beat someone up badly, would that stop you from doing it?

Do you think that getting sent to boot camp for beating someone up is a fair punishment?

If you did a B & E, do you think that you would be caught by the police?

If someone told you that you would be sent to a boot camp program if you did a B & E, would that stop you from doing it?

Do you think that getting sent to the boot camp for breaking into a house is a fair punishment?

Have you had a lot of contact with the police?

What do you think about the police?

What was your experience in court like?

In the past twelve months have you robbed someone? How many times?

The last time that you robbed someone, why did you do it?

In the last year have you beat someone up so badly that you think they probably needed a doctor? How many times?

The last time that you beat someone up, why did you do that?

Have you broken into any houses or buildings in the past year? How many times?

The last time that you broke into a house or building, why did you do that?

If you could design a program to keep kids from committing crime, what would it be like?

What do you think you'll be doing in a years time? How about five years time?

References

- Anderson, Linda S., Theodore G. Chiricos, and Gordon P. Waldo. (1977). Formal and informal sanctions: A comparison of deterrent effects. Social Problems. 25: 103-114.
- Anderson, Andy B., Anthony R. Harris, and JoAnn Miller. (1983). Models of deterrence theory. Social Science Research. 12(3): 236-262.
- Apospori, Eleni and Geoffrey Alpert. (1993). Research note: The role of differential experience with the criminal justice system in changes in perceptions of severity of legal sanctions over time. Crime and Delinquency. 39(2): 184-194.
- Bailey, William C. (1976). Certainty of arrest and crime rates for major felonies: A research note. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency. 13(July): 155-164.
- Bailey, William C. (1980). Deterrence and the celerity of the death penalty: A neglected question in deterrence research. Social Forces. 58(4): 1308-1333.
- Bailey, William C. and Ronald W. Smith. (1972). Punishment: Its severity and certainty. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science. 63(4): 530-539.
- Bala, Nicholas. (1994). What's wrong with YOA bashing? What's wrong with the YOA? — Recognizing the limits of the law. Canadian Journal of Criminology. 36(3): 247-270.
- Baron, Stephen W. and Timothy F. Hartnagel. (1996). 'Lock em up': Attitudes toward punishing juvenile offenders. Canadian Journal of Criminology. 38(3): 191-212.
- Bindman, Stephen, and Jim Bronskill. (1998, May 12). Youth justice overhaul. Liberal package offers no criminal sanctions for those younger than 12. The Windsor Star.

pp. A1, A2.

Bishop, Donna M. (1984). Legal and extralegal barriers to delinquency. Criminology. 22(3): 403-419.

Blackwell, Tom. (1998, June 2). No more hugs for thugs? Report urges public shaming, tough love for young offenders. The Windsor Star. pp. A1, A2.

Blackwell, Brenda Sims, Harold G. Grasmick, and John K. Cochran. (1994). Racial differences in perceived sanction threat: Static and dynamic hypotheses. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency. 31(2): 210-224.

Box, Steven. (1987). Recession, Crime and Punishment. Hampshire: MacMillan Education Ltd.

Braithwaite, John. (1989). Crime, Shame and Reintegration. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Braithwaite, John. (1993). Shame and modernity. The British Journal of Criminology. 33(1): 1-18.

Brennan, Richard. (1995, July 29). Runciman prepares law-and-order era. The Windsor Star. pp. A1, A4.

Brennan, Richard. (1997, February 12). Ontario boot camps gentler than in U.S. The Windsor Star. p. A12.

Bridges, George S. and James A. Stone. (1986). Effects of criminal punishment on perceived threat of punishment: Toward an understanding of specific deterrence. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency. 23(3): 207-239.

Brownfield, David, and Kevin Thompson. (1995). Attachment to peers and delinquent behaviour. In James Creechan and Robert A. Silverman (Eds.), Canadian

Delinquency. Toronto: Prentice-Hall.

Burkett, Steven R., and David A. Ward. (1993). A note on perceptual deterrence, religiously based moral condemnation, and social control. Criminology. 31: 119-134.

Canada. House of Commons. (1994). Bill C-37. An Act to Amend the Young Offenders Act and the Criminal Code. Ottawa: House of Commons.

Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics. (1994). Trends in criminal victimization: 1988-1993. Juristat Service Bulletin. 14(13). Ottawa: Minister of Industry, Science and Technology.

Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics. (1995). Public perceptions of crime. Juristat Service Bulletin. 15(1). Ottawa: Minister of Industry, Science and Technology.

Canadian Youth Foundation. (1995). Youth Unemployment: Canada's Hidden Deficit. Ottawa: Canadian Youth Foundation.

Caputo, T. C. (1987). The Young Offenders Act: Children's Rights, Children's Wrongs. Canadian Public Policy. XIII(2): 125-143.

Carmody, Dianne Cyr and Kirk R. Williams. (1987). Wife assault and perceptions of sanctions. Violence and Victims. 2(1): 25-38.

Carrington, Peter J. (1995). Has violent youth crime increased? Comment on Corrado and Markwart. Canadian Journal of Criminology. 37(1): 51-73.

Carrington, Peter J. and Sharon Moyer. (1995). Trends in youth crime and police response, pre- and post-YOA. Canadian Journal of Criminology. 36(1): 1-28.

Chambliss, William J. (1966). The deterrent influence of punishment. Crime and Delinquency. 12: 70.

- Clark, Barry and Thomas O'Reilly-Fleming. (1993). Implementing the Young Offenders Act in Ontario: Issues of principles, programmes and power. The Howard Journal. 32(2): 114-126.
- Clark, Richard D. (1988). Celerity and specific deterrence: A look at the evidence. Canadian Journal of Criminology. 30(April): 109-120.
- Claster, Donald S. (1967). Comparisons of risk perceptions between delinquents and non-delinquents. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science. 58: 80-86.
- Corrado, Raymond R., Nicholas Bala, Rick Linden, and Marc Le Blanc. (1992). Juvenile Justice in Canada: A Theoretical and Analytical Assessment. Toronto: Butterworths.
- Corrado, Raymond R. and Alan Markwart. (1994). The need to reform the YOA in response to violent young offenders: Confusion, reality or myth? Canadian Journal of Criminology. 36(3): 343-378.
- Creechan, James. (1995). A test of the general theory of crime: Delinquency and school dropouts. In James Creechan and Robert A. Silverman (Eds.), Canadian Delinquency. Toronto: Prentice-Hall.
- Creswell, John W. (1994). Research Design: Qualitative & Quantitative Approaches. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Crime fears give Conservatives a 'wedge.' (1999, March 22). The Windsor Star. p. A9.
- Crow, Iain, Richardson, Paul, Riddington, Carol, and Frances Simon. (1989). Unemployment, Crime, and Offenders. New York: Routledge.
- Cusson, Maurice. (1983). Why Delinquency?. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

- Decker, Scott H. and Carol W. Kohfeld. (1985). Crimes, crime rates, arrests, and arrest rations: Implications for deterrence theory. Criminology. 23(3): 437-450.
- Decker, Scott H., Richard Wright, and Robert Logie. (1993). Perceptual deterrence among active residential burglars: A research note. Criminology. 31: 135-147.
- Doob, Anthony N., Voula Marinos, and Kimberly N. Varma. (1995). Youth Crime and the Youth Justice System in Canada: A Research Perspective. University of Toronto: Centre of Criminology.
- Elliott, Delbert S. and Suzanne S. Ageton. (1980). Reconciling race and class differences in self-reported and official estimates of delinquency. American Sociological Review. 45(February): 95-110.
- Erickson, Maynard L. and Jack P. Gibbs. (1973). The deterrence question: Some alternative methods of analysis. Social Science Quarterly. 54(3): 534-551.
- Farnworth, Margaret, Terence P. Thornberry, Marvin D. Krohn, and Alan J. Lizotte. (1994). Measurement in the study of class and delinquency: Integrating theory and research. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency. 31(1): 32-61.
- Foot, David K., and Jeanne C. Li. (1986). Youth employment in Canada: A misplaced priority? Canadian Public Policy. 12(3): 499-506.
- Frank, Jeffrey. (1992). Violent youth crime. Canadian Social Trends. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Geerken, Michael, and Walter R. Gove. (1975). Deterrence: Some theoretical considerations. Law and Society Review. 9(3): 497-513.
- Geerken, Michael, and Walter R. Gove. (1977). Deterrence, overload, and incapacitation: An empirical evaluation. Social Forces. 56(2): 424-447.

- Gendreau, Paul, and Robert R. Ross. (1993). Revivification of rehabilitation: Evidence from the 1980's. In Thomas O'Reilly-Fleming and Barry Clark (Eds.), Youth Injustice: Canadian Perspectives. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press Inc.
- Gertz, Marc G. and Leroy C. Gould. (1995). Fear of punishment and the willingness to engage in criminal behaviour: A research note. Journal of Criminal Justice. 23(4): 377-384.
- Gibbs, Jack P. (1977a). Social control, deterrence, and perspectives on social order. Social Forces. 56(2): 408-423.
- Glassner, Barry, Margret Ksander, Bruce Berg, and Bruce D. Johnson. (1983). A note on the deterrent effect of juvenile vs. adult jurisdiction. Social Problems. 31(2): 219-221.
- Goldenberg, Sheldon. (1992). Thinking Methodologically. New York: HarperCollins Publishers Inc.
- Government of Canada. (1999a, March). Fact Sheet: Youth Justice Statistics. Department of Justice.
- Government of Canada. (1999b, March 11). News Release: Minister of Justice Introduces New Youth Justice Law. Department of Justice.
- Government of Canada. (1999c, March 11). Background: Youth Criminal Justice Act. Department of Justice.
- Grasmick, Harold G. (1981). The strategy of deterrence research: A reply to Greenberg. The Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology. 72(3): 1102-1108.
- Grasmick, Harold G. and George J. Bryjak. (1980). The deterrent effect of perceived severity of punishment. Social Forces. 59(2): 471-491.

- Grasmick, Harold G. and Robert J. Bursik, Jr. (1990). Conscience, significant others, and rational choice: Extending the deterrence model. Law and Society Review. 24: 837-861.
- Grasmick, Harold G., Robert J. Bursik, Jr., and Bruce J. Arneklev. (1993). Reduction in drunk driving as a response to increased threats of shame, embarrassment, and legal sanctions. Criminology. 31(1): 41-67.
- Grasmick, Harold, Robert J. Bursik, Jr., and John Cochran. (1991). Render unto Caesar what is Caesar's": Religiosity and taxpayers' inclinations to cheat. Sociological Quarterly. 32(2): 251-266.
- Grasmick, Harold G. and Donald E. Green. (1980). Legal punishment, social disapproval and internalization as inhibitors of illegal behaviour. Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology. 71: 325-335.
- Grasmick, Harold G., Darlene Jacobs, and Carol B. McCollom. (1983). Social class and social control: An application of deterrence theory. Social Forces. 62(2): 359-374.
- Grasmick, Harold G. and Herman Milligan Jr. (1976). Deterrence theory approach to socioeconomic/demographic correlates of crime. Social Science Quarterly. 57(3): 608-617.
- Gray, Louis N., Alfred C. Miranne, III, David A. Ward, and Ben Menke. (1982). A game theoretic analysis of the components of punishment. Social Psychology Quarterly. 45(4): 206-212.
- Green, Donald E. (1989a). Past behaviour as a measure of actual future behaviour: An unresolved issue in perceptual deterrence research. Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology. 80: 781-804.

- Green, Donald E. (1989b). The effect of sanction threat on self-reported drinking and driving behaviour: A comparison of sampling procedures in perceptual deterrence research. Free Inquiry in Creative Sociology. 17(2): 165-173.
- Green, Donald E. (1989c). Measures of illegal behaviour in individual-level deterrence research. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency. 26(3): 253-275.
- Greenberg, David F. (1981). Methodological issues in survey research on the inhibitions of crime. Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology. 72: 1094-1101.
- Greenberg, David F., Ronald C. Kessler, and Charles H. Logan. (1981). Aggregation bias in deterrence research: An empirical analysis. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency. 18(1): 128-137.
- Griffiths, Curt T. and Simon N. Verdun-Jones. (1994). Canadian Criminal Justice. 2nd Ed. Toronto: Harcourt Brace & Company.
- Hagan, John. (1993). The social embeddedness of crime and unemployment. Criminology. 31(4): 465-491.
- Hartnagel, Timothy F. (1990). Under/Unemployment and Crime Among Youth: A Longitudinal Study of Recent High School Graduates. Discussion Paper #23. Centre for Criminological Research, The University of Alberta: Population Research Laboratory.
- Hartnagel, Timothy F. and Stephen W. Baron. (1995). It's time to get serious: Public attitudes toward juvenile justice in Canada. In James Creechan and Robert A. Silverman (Eds.), Canadian Delinquency. Toronto: Prentice-Hall.
- Hartnagel, Timothy F. and Harvey Krahn. (1995). High school dropouts, labour market success, and criminal behaviour. In James Creechan and Robert A. Silverman

(Eds.), Canadian Delinquency. Toronto: Prentice-Hall.

Havemann, Paul. (1986). From child saving to child blaming: The political economy of the Young Offenders Act 1908-1984. In S. Brickley and E. Comack. (Eds.). The Social Basis of Law. Toronto: Garamond Press.

Hirschi, Travis. (1969). Causes of Delinquency. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Hornberger, Rob. (1994, December 10). Robbing from the cradle. The Windsor Star. pp. F1, F8.

Horney, Julie, and Ineke Haen Marshall. (1992). Risk perceptions among serious offenders: The role of crime and punishment. Criminology. 30(4): 575-594.

Howe, Edmund S. and Cynthia J. Brandau. (1988). Additive effects of certainty, severity, and celerity of punishment on judgments of crime deterrence. Journal of Applied Social Psychology. 18(9): 796-812.

Hylton, John H. (1994). Get tough or get smart? Options for Canada's youth justice system in the twenty-first century. Canadian Journal of Criminology. 36(3): 229-246.

Jensen, Eric L. and Linda K. Metsger. (1994). A test of the deterrent effect of legislative waiver on violent juvenile crime. Crime and Delinquency. 40(1): 96-104.

Jensen, Gary F., Maynard L. Erickson, and Jack P. Gibbs. (1978). Perceived risk of punishment and self-reported delinquency. Social Forces. 57(1): 57-78.

Keane, Carl, A. Gillis, and John Hagan. (1989). Deterrence and amplification of juvenile delinquency by police contact: The importance of gender and risk orientation. British Journal of Criminology. 29(4): 336-352.

- Kirby, Sandra and Kate McKenna. (1989). Experience. Research. Social Change. Methods from the Margins. Toronto: Garamond Press.
- Kirk, Jerome and Marc L. Miller. (1986). Reliability and Validity in Qualitative Research. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Klemke, Lloyd W. (1978). Does apprehension for shoplifting amplify or terminate shoplifting activity? Law and Society Review. 12(3): 391-403.
- Kraut, R. (1976). Deterrent and definitional influences on shoplifting. Social Problems. 23(February): 358-368.
- Ladouceur, Carol and Louise L. Biron. (1993). Écouler la marchandise volée, une approche rationnelle? Canadian Journal of Criminology. (April): 169-182.
- Lanza-Kaduce, Lonn. (1988). Perceptual deterrence and drinking and driving among college students. Criminology. 26: 321-343.
- Le Blanc, Marc. (1995). Family dynamics, adolescent delinquency, and adult criminality. In James Creechan and Robert A. Silverman (Eds.), Canadian Delinquency. Toronto: Prentice-Hall.
- LeBlanc, Marc and Marcel Fréchette. (1989). Male Criminal Activity from Childhood Through Youth: Multilevel and Developmental Perspectives. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Leschied, Alan W. and Paul Gendreau. (1993). The declining role of rehabilitation in Canadian juvenile justice: Implications of underlying theory in the Young Offenders Act. In Thomas O'Reilly-Fleming and Barry Clark (Eds.), Youth Injustice: Canadian Perspectives. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press Inc.
- Logan, Charles. (1972). General deterrent effects of imprisonment. Social Forces.

51(September): 64-73.

Lundman, Richard J. (1986). One-wave perceptual deterrence research: Some grounds for the renewed examination of cross-sectional methods. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency. 23: 370-388.

Mann, Thomas. (1998, March 22). Doing hard time. The Ottawa Citizen. p. B5.

McClelland, Kent A. and Geoffrey P. Alpert. (1985). Factor analysis applied to magnitude estimates of punishment seriousness: Patterns of individual differences. Journal of Quantitative Criminology. 1(3): 307-318.

McDevitt, Teresa M., Lennon, Randy, and Rebecca J. Kopriva. (1991). Adolescents' perceptions of mothers' and fathers' prosocial actions and empathic responses. Youth and Society. 22(3): 387-409.

Miles, M.B. and A.M. Huberman. (1994). Qualitative Data Analysis: An expanded source-book. 2nd Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Minor, W. W. and J. Harry. (1982). Deterrent and experiential effects in perceptual deterrence research: A replication and extension. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency. 19: 190-203.

Miranne, Alfred C., III and Louis N. Gray. (1987). Deterrence: A laboratory experiment. Deviant Behaviour. 8: 191-203.

Nagin, Daniel and Raymond Paternoster. (1991). The preventative effects of the perceived risk of arrest: Testing an expanded conception of deterrence. Criminology. 29: 561-587.

Neuman, W. Laurence. (1991). Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches. Toronto: Allyn and Bacon.

Ontario Ministry of the Solicitor General and Correctional Services. (1996).

Recommendations from the Task Force on Strict Discipline for Young Offenders to the Ontario Solicitor General and Minister of Correctional Services. Final report and recommendations of the Task Force on Strict Discipline for Young Offenders.

PC's stake out crime as issue. (1999, March 2). The Windsor Star. p. A7.

Pate, Antony and Edwin E. Hamilton. (1992). Formal and informal deterrents to domestic violence: The Dade County spouse assault experiment. American Sociological Review. 57(October): 691-697.

Paternoster, Raymond. (1986). The use of composite scales in perceptual deterrence research: A cautionary note. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency. 23: 128-168.

Paternoster, Raymond. (1988). Examining three-wave deterrence models: A question of temporal order and specification. The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology. 79(1): 135-179.

Paternoster, Raymond. (1989a). Decisions to participate in and desist from four types of common delinquency: Deterrence and the rational choice perspective. Law & Society Review. 23(1): 7-40.

Paternoster, Raymond. (1989b). Absolute and restrictive deterrence in a panel of youth: Explaining the onset, persistence/desistance, and frequency of delinquent offending. Social Problems. 36(3): 289-309.

Paternoster, Raymond, and Leeann Iovanni. (1986). The deterrent effect of perceived severity: A reexamination. Social Forces. 64: 751-777.

Paternoster, Raymond, Linda E. Saltzman, Theodore G. Chiricos, and Gordon P. Waldo.

(1982). Perceived risk and deterrence: Methodological artifacts in perceptual deterrence research. Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology. 73(3): 1,238-1,258.

Paternoster, Raymond, Linda E. Saltzman, Gordon P. Waldo and Theodore G. Chiricos.

(1983). Perceived risk and social control: Do sanctions really deter? Law and Society Review. 17: 457-479.

Paternoster, Raymond, Linda E. Saltzman, Gordon P. Waldo and Theodore G. Chiricos.

(1985). Assessments of risk and behavioral experience: An exploratory study of change. Criminology. 23: 417-433.

Pestello, H. Frances. (1983). Fear and misbehavior in a high school. The Sociological Quarterly.

24(Autumn): 561-573.

Petee, Thomas A., Trudie F. Milner, and Michael R. Welch. (1994). Levels of social

integration in group contexts and the effects of informal sanction threat on deviance. Criminology. 32(1): 85-106.

Piliavin, Irving, Rosemary Gartner, Craig Thornton, and Ross L. Matsueda. (1986).

Crime, deterrence, and rational choice. American Sociological Review.

51(February): 101-119.

Power, Stephanie. (1998). Boiling point at Innes. Capital City. p. 5.

Project Turnaround. (1998). Treatment Programs. Information package distributed by

Project Turnaround in response to request for information.

Rankin, Joseph H., and Edward Wells. (1982). The social context of deterrence.

Sociology and Social Research. 67: 18-39.

- Rausch, Sharla. (1983). Court processing versus diversion of status offenders: A test of deterrence and labelling theories. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency. 20(January): 39-54.
- Saltzman, Linda E., Raymond Paternoster, Gordon P. Waldo, and Theodore G. Chiricos. (1982). Deterrent and experiential effects: The problem of causal order in perceptual deterrence research. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency. 19: 172-189.
- Schneider, Anne L. and Laurie Ervin. (1990). Specific deterrence, rational choice, and decision heuristics: Applications in juvenile justice. Social Science Quarterly. 71(3): 585-601.
- Scott, Wilbur J. and Harold G. Grasmick. (1981). Deterrence and income tax cheating: Testing interaction hypotheses in utilitarian theories. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science. 17(3): 395-408.
- Selke, William L. (1983). Celerity: The ignored variable in deterrence research. Journal of Police Science and Administration. 11(1): 31-37.
- Shaw, James W. and Doris L. MacKenzie. (1992). The one-year community supervision performance of drug offenders and Louisiana DOC-identified substance abusers graduating from shock incarceration. Journal of Criminal Justice. 20: 501-516.
- Sherman, Lawrence W. (1993). Defiance, deterrence, and irrelevance: A theory of the criminal sanction. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency. 30(4): 445-473.
- Sherman, Lawrence W., and Richard A. Berk. (1984). The specific deterrent effects of arrest for domestic assault. American Sociological Review. 49: 261-272.

- Sherman, Lawrence W., Janell Schmidt, Dennis Rogan, Patrick Gartin, Ellen Cohn, Dean Collins, and Anthony Bacich. (1991). From initial deterrence to long-term escalation: Short custody arrest for poverty ghetto domestic violence. Criminology. 29: 821-850.
- Shore, Elsie R. and Eugene Maguin. (1988). Deterrence of drinking driving: The effect of changes in the Kansas Driving under the Influence law. Evaluation and Program Planning. 11(3): 245-254.
- Siegel, Larry J. (1992). Criminology. 4th Ed. New York: West Publishing Company.
- Silberman, M. (1976). Toward a theory of criminal deterrence. American Sociological Review. 41(June): 442-461.
- Silverman, R.A. (1990). Trends in Canadian youth homicide: Some unanticipated consequences of a change in law. Canadian Journal of Criminology. 32(4): 651-656.
- Silverman, R.A. and L. Kennedy. (1993). Deadly deeds: Murder in Canada. Scarborough, Ontario: Nelson.
- Singer, Simon I. and David McDowall. (1988). Criminalizing delinquency: The deterrent effects of the New York Juvenile Offender Law. Law & Society Review. 22(3): 521-535.
- Smrke, Jacqueline. (1995, February 14). Today: Youth crime on the rise nationally. The Windsor Star. pp. A5.
- Sprott, Jane B. (1996). Understanding public views of youth crime and the youth justice system. Canadian Journal of Criminology. 38(3): 271-290.
- Stafford, Mark C. and Mark Warr. (1993). A reconceptualization of general and specific

- deterrence. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency. 30(2):123-135.
- Sykes, Gresham M., and David Matza. (1957). Techniques of neutralization: A theory of delinquency. American Sociological Review. 22: 664-670.
- Tanner, Julian. (1996). Teenage Troubles: Youth and Deviance in Canada. Toronto, Ontario: Nelson.
- Teevan, J. (1976a). Deterrent effects of punishment: Subjective measures continued. Canadian Journal of Criminology and Corrections. 18(April): 152-160.
- Teevan, J. (1976b). Subjective perceptions of deterrence. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency. 13(July): 155-164.
- Tesch, R. (1990). Qualitative Research: Analysis Types and Software Tools. London: Falmer.
- Thomas, Charles W. and Donna M. Bishop. (1984). The effect of formal and informal sanctions on delinquency: A longitudinal comparison of labeling and deterrence theories. The Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology. 75(4): 1,222-1,245.
- Thornberry, Terence P., Alan J. Lizotte, Marvin D. Krohn, Margaret Farnworth, and Sung Joon Jang. (1994). Delinquent peers, beliefs, and delinquent behaviour: A longitudinal test of interactional theory. Criminology. 32(1): 47-83.
- Tibbetts, Janice. (1999, February 10). Young Offenders Act changes coming soon. The Windsor Star. p. D10.
- Tittle, Charles R. (1969). Crime rates and legal sanctions. Social Problems. 16(Spring): 409-423.
- Tittle, Charles R. (1977). Sanction fear and the maintenance of social order. Social Forces. 55(March): 579-596.

- Tittle, Charles R. (1983). Social class and criminal behaviour: A critique of the theoretical foundation. Social Forces. 62(2): 334-358.
- Tittle, Charles R. and C. Logan. (1973). Sanctions and deviance: Evidence and remaining questions. Law and Society Review. 7(Spring): 371-392.
- Tittle, Charles R. and Alan R. Rowe. (1973): Moral appeal, sanction threat, and deviance: An experimental test. Social Problems. 20(4): 488-498.
- Waldo, Gordon P., and Theodore G. Chiricos. (1972). Perceived penal sanction and self-reported criminality: A neglected approach to deterrence research. Social Problems. 19: 522-540.
- Warr, Mark and Mark Stafford. (1991). The influence of delinquent peers: What they think or what they do? Criminology. 29(4): 851-866.
- Williams, Kirk R. and Jack P. Gibbs. (1981). Deterrence and knowledge of statutory penalties. Sociological Quarterly. 22(4): 591-606.
- Williams, Franklin P. and Marilyn D. McShane. (1994). Criminological Theory. 2nd Ed. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Williams, Kirk R. and Richard Hawkins. (1986). Perceptual research on general deterrence: A critical review. Law and Society Review. 20(4): 545-572.
- Yu, Jiang. (1994). Punishment celerity and severity: Testing a specific deterrence model on drunk driving recidivism. Journal of Criminal Justice. 22(4): 355-366.
- Zimring, Franklin E. (1981). Kids, groups and crime: Some implications of a well-known secret. The Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology. 72(3): 867-885.
- Zimring, Frank E., and Gordon J. Hawkins. (1973). Deterrence: The Legal Threat in Crime Control. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Vita Auctoris

NAME: Jill Elizabeth Johns

PLACE OF BIRTH: Chatham, Ontario

YEAR OF BIRTH: 1972

EDUCATION: Ridgetown District High School, Ridgetown, Ontario
1986-1991

University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario
1992-1996 Bachelor of Arts (Honours Criminology)

University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario
1996-1999 Master of Arts (Sociology)