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ABSTRACT

This research evaluated the effectiveness of a federal offender program at the John Howard Society of Hamilton-Wentworth called Counter-Point. The sample for this research consisted of forty-four male federal criminal offenders.

The Level of Service Inventory-Revised (LSI-R) was used to assess changes in nine dynamic (i.e. changeable) life domains. The LSI-R is a standardized instrument used to gather information about program participants. The LSI-R consists of fifty-four items across ten domains (i.e. one static and nine dynamic) representing major risk or need areas found in research to be predictive of recidivism. Domain assessment was documented at entry and exit from the Counter-Point program. LSI-R participant data was used from ten separate Counter-Point sessions between April 1997 and September 1999.

Counter-Point’s goal was to affect change in the nine dynamic life domains. Counter-Point’s program was based on a subset of Social Learning Theory referred to as Differential Association-Reinforcement Theory. The program included activities designed to alter offender attitudes, values and thinking patterns from pro-criminal towards pro-social patterns. Using domains measured by the LSI-R, the two hypotheses put forth for this evaluation research were: 1) there will be change toward pro-social attitudes and behaviours in all nine dynamic life domains. 2) the five dynamic life domains of ‘leisure/recreation’, ‘companions’, ‘alcohol/drug problem’, ‘emotional/personal’, and ‘attitudes/orientation’, as measured by the before-program and after-program LSI-R, will have greater change than the following four dynamic domains of ‘education/employment’, ‘financial’, ‘family/marital’, and ‘accommodation’.

Changes in all nine dynamic domain scores were in the predicted direction and were statistically significant in paired t-tests: these results support the first hypothesis. The second hypothesis was partially supported by these results: there were greater levels of change for the ‘attitudes/orientation’, and ‘leisure/recreational’ domains, than the levels of change for the ‘family/marital’, and ‘education/employment’ domains. The domains of ‘financial’, ‘accommodation’, ‘emotional/personal’, ‘alcohol/drug problem’, and ‘companions’ all showed statistically significant changes as well, however the level of change differed from the levels hypothesized. The results support the success of the Counter-Point program and add to the growing body of research supporting the overall success of offender rehabilitation programs.
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INTRODUCTION

There has been an ongoing debate spanning three decades concerning the effectiveness of rehabilitation programs targeting criminal offenders. At the center of this debate is the question of ‘What works?’ in the realm of offender rehabilitation. The rehabilitation model focuses on changing specific factors in the lives of offenders which are considered predictive of recidivism (i.e. repeat criminal offences). If rehabilitation programs are successful in changing these factors, then the rates of recidivism should decrease while rehabilitating offenders to become productive members of society.

This study evaluates the effectiveness of a federal offender program at the John Howard Society of Hamilton-Wentworth called Counter-Point. The targets and goals which this program sets for itself include: establishing a context for change, countering pro-criminal attitudes, altering anti-social attitudes, developing pro-social problem solving, developing victim awareness, and maintaining change (refer to Appendix I). The program is built on the philosophy that creating change in these targeted areas will result in decreased recidivism. Change is brought about through programs that are designed to address specific targets and areas of concern.

The Level of Service Inventory Revised (LSI-R) was used as the data gathering tool for this research (refer to Appendix II). The LSI-R has been introduced as a program evaluation tool for many John Howard Societies (JHS) across Ontario. The JHS of Hamilton-Wentworth staff have been trained to use the LSI-R for their programs, and have recently begun implementing the evaluation tool. This study is the first time the LSI-R has been used to evaluate the Counter-Point program in Hamilton.
Research has indicated that the major areas predictive of recidivism include both what are referred to as static unchangeable life domains such as criminal history, and dynamic changeable life domains such as anti-social personality traits, employment, anti-social associates, and criminogenic needs (i.e. changeable risk factors). Counter-Point's goal is to affect change in the dynamic life domains. Counter-Point's program is based on Social Learning Theory; in particular the subset of Social Learning Theory referred to as Differential Association-Reinforcement Theory. The program includes activities designed to alter offender attitudes, values and thinking patterns from anti-social and pro-criminal towards pro-social and anti-criminal patterns. Using domains measured by the Level of Service Inventory-Revised, the two hypotheses put forth for this evaluation research were: 1) there will be change toward pro-social attitudes and behaviours in all nine dynamic (i.e. changeable) life domains. 2) the five dynamic life domains of leisure/recreation, companions, alcohol/drug problem, emotional/personal, and attitudes/orientation, as measured by the before-program and after-program LSI-R, will have greater change than the following four dynamic domains of education/employment, financial, family/marital, and accommodation.
THEORETICAL ORIENTATION

An essential element for effective programming is the theory or logic on which the program is grounded. Unfortunately, theory is often neglected during program development, resulting in a potential barrier between program proceedings and the effect the program is designed to have on the participants (Sadava & McCreary, 1997). Izzo and Ross in their meta-analysis of rehabilitation programs for juvenile delinquents concluded that programs that are theoretically grounded are five times more likely to succeed as compared to programs with no theoretical base (Izzo & Ross, 1990). Social Learning Theory is the foundation on which Counter-Point is built and will subsequently be reviewed here.

Social Learning Theory

Social Learning Theory explains that an individual may learn deviant behaviour through a process of rewards and punishments from their social environment (Akers, 1973). The role of the social environment is more fully developed in Ronald Akers’ Differential Association-Reinforcement Theory, a revision of Edwin Sutherland’s original differential association theory (Sutherland & Cressey, 19781: Akers, 1973).

Differential Association-Reinforcement Theory integrates differential association with differential reinforcement to produce a new and revised theory. Ronald Akers outlines seven components of the reformulated theory:

---

1 This is a revised (tenth) edition of Edwin Sutherland’s original copyright from 1924. Rewritten and reset by Sutherland in 1934, 1939, and 1947. Rewritten and reset, with co-author Donald Cressey in 1955, 1960, 1970, and 1974.
1) Deviant behaviour is learned according to the principles of operant conditioning.

2) Deviant behaviour is learned both in nonsocial situations that are reinforcing or discriminative and through social interaction in which the behaviour of other persons is reinforcing or discriminative for such behaviour.

3) The principal part of the learning of deviant behaviour occurs in those groups which comprise or control the individual's major source of reinforcements.

4) The learning of deviant behaviour, including specific techniques, attitudes and avoidance procedures, is a function of the effective and available reinforcers and the existing reinforcement contingencies.

5) The specific class of behaviour which is learned and its frequency of occurrence are a function of the reinforcers which are effective and available, and the deviant or nondeviant direction of the norms, rules, and definitions which in the past have accompanied the reinforcement.

6) The probability that a person will commit deviant behaviour is increased in the presence of normative statements, definitions, and verbalizations which have acquired discriminative value of such behaviour over conforming behaviour.

7) The strength of deviant behaviour is a direct function of the amount, frequency, and probability of its reinforcement. The modalities of association with deviant patterns are important in so far as they affect the source, amount, and scheduling of reinforcement (Akers, 1973).
Punishment and Reinforcement

Punishment and reinforcement are central to this theory. A response or reaction to a behaviour is reinforcement when it has the effect of strengthening the behaviour or increasing the likelihood of repeated behaviour under similar circumstances (Akers, 1973). There are two kinds of consequences that have this effect on behaviour: positive and negative reinforcement. Positive reinforcement increases the rate of the behaviour by giving something to the individual which he desires in response to the action. Negative reinforcement is based on taking something away that is undesirable, unpleasant or painful when a desired behaviour is performed (1973).

Punishment may also be positive (i.e. adding) or negative (i.e. taking away) (Akers, 1973). In the former case something undesirable, unpleasant or painful is added: in the latter something desirable or pleasant, is taken away in response to undesirable behaviour (Akers, 1973).

Akers recognizes that the same stimulus can evoke different responses and different sets of understanding for different people, times, and places (1973). When investigating specific individual behaviour within subcultures (or even the larger culture) we must recognize that each person has his or her own history of conditioning. However, since we are all raised as part of a larger group (a society or subculture within a society), “a knowledge of group history, social structure, and cultural values enables us to make some predictions about what are likely to be effective and available reinforcers for members of specific groups and collectivities” (Akers, 1973:51).
Akers contends that most learning that leads to deviant behaviour results from a person's environment, including peers and social interactions where the individual receives reinforcement from others for the deviant or criminal activity (1973). The primary group (i.e. those with whom one is in a close personal relationship) provides the person with the most influential reinforcements. Secondary or reference groups (i.e. those with whom one interacts but is not intimately or personally connected) also play a part in the person's reinforcement environment, but are less influential than the primary group (1973).

Imitation

Imitation as well as direct rewards and punishments is another process for learning. Those who are in constant contact with an individual, usually primary groups but also secondary and reference groups, provide models for a person to learn from through imitation, thus influencing a person's behaviour to take the shape of those around him (Akers, 1973). There are two forms of imitation: that which is adopted because the individual observes those around him being rewarded for certain behaviour and/or behaviour which is directly reinforced (1973).

Differential Reinforcement

Differential reinforcement determines which behaviour will dominate (Akers, 1973). When imitation and reinforcement (both rewards and punishments) favour deviant (by societal standards) over conformist behaviour, deviant behaviour becomes dominant (1973). Thus, deviant behaviour must be recognized as learned in the same way as conformist behaviour and, in actuality, is behaviour that conforms (i.e. is conformist), but to a deviant model and norms.
Akers reports Sutherland's emphasis on the two areas that are learned to enable deviant behaviour in his original differential association theory: "1) learning techniques that would enable the individual to commit crime. and 2) learning definitions which motivate or make the individual willing to commit crime" (Akers. 1973: 54). Both are preserved in Differential Association-Reinforcement Theory (1973). The first is obviously needed in order to have the actual skills to commit certain crimes, such as learning how to pick-pocket (Akers. 1973). The second necessity is willingness to engage in criminal acts. Sutherland proposed that through interaction with others, the person can be exposed to particular world views, belief systems and attitudes that approve of criminal acts (1978). When these are adopted (learned) by the individual as his or her own, then deviant or criminal behaviour is normative and there is motivation to conduct criminal behaviour (Akers. 1973).

There are two classes of beliefs or attitudes that support criminal behaviour: 1) "those which place the behaviour in a positive light, defining it as desirable or permissible" (Akers. 1973:55), and 2) "definitions which...neutralize the behaviour as undesirable" (Akers. 1973:56).

Subcultural groups provide the environment for an individual to learn the norms that define what is approved or disapproved through imitation and the reinforcing or punishing responses of others (Akers. 1973). Central to this perspective is that the individual's interaction with those around him or her plays a primary role in producing behaviour that conforms to subcultural norms and beliefs and attitudes that support the desirability and 'correctness' of the behaviour (Akers, 1973). When the behaviour deviates from the norms and laws of the dominant culture, the individual must deal with formal and legal (punishing)
consequences. However, Akers proposes that these consequences have less impact on the individual’s actions than the norms, rewards and punishments of the primary group (Akers, 1973).

Based on Differential Association-Reinforcement Theory we would conclude that to prevent recurrence of criminal behaviour, a rehabilitation program must:

1) change beliefs and attitudes that support criminal behaviour as desirable and "correct" (anti-social norms) to beliefs and attitudes that view criminal behaviour as undesirable and "incorrect": 2) instill beliefs and attitudes that support non-criminal behaviours as desirable and correct (pro-social norms); 3) remove the individual from the subculture and primary group that is supportive of anti-social norms: 4) integrate the individual into a subculture and primary group that is supportive of pro-social norms; 5) address gaps in skills required for success (and consequent positive reinforcement from) in non-criminal activities of daily living (i.e. securing income, leisure activities, interpersonal relationships).
LITERATURE REVIEW

Evaluation of rehabilitation programs and how they address offender needs is on the rise. There have been hundreds of studies produced that investigate what works and what does not in terms of preventing recidivism. There is a growing consensus, based on this research, as to what factors can predict whether an offender will re-offend in the future and how these can be addressed in rehabilitation programs. To date, such promising findings have not produced a major shift in the treatment of convicted offenders. primarily due to the costs of changing from a punishment to a rehabilitation approach and the business model imposed on the Canadian Correctional system. However, research over the last three decades has begun to point our correction system onto a new path of rehabilitation as the evidence for reduced recidivism resulting from well-designed rehabilitation programs mounts.

For the purpose of this study, literature will be reviewed from four areas of investigation. The first area is a review of three meta-analyses that investigate what works in terms of rehabilitation. Two of these address what programs were most successful in their goals for rehabilitation, and what target areas in the programs produced the best results concerning offender recidivism. The last article concentrates specifically on predictors of offender recidivism, and which programs were most successful in targeting those predictor domains. The second area is research on factors predictive of recidivism. In this area of research, thirteen articles are reviewed. Six articles outline which areas of offenders’ lives can be predictors of re-offence, therefore which areas are essential targets for treatment in rehabilitation programs. In addition, seven articles were found that concentrate on specific domains found to be predictive of recidivism (employment, associates, substance abuse,
attitude, community functioning, marital and family, personal and emotional). The third area addresses the importance of theory in rehabilitation programs. Finally, there are two articles that review the Level of Service Inventory and several other assessment tools being used in the corrections system for criminal offenders.

Meta-analyses of Predictors of Recidivism Review

Three meta-analyses have been conducted on research on predictors of recidivism (Gendreau et al., 1996; Izzo & Ross, 1990; Whitehead & Lab., 1989). Gendreau, Little and Goggin (1996) were interested in what the best predictors were for adult recidivism in terms of predictor domains and actuarial assessment instruments (assessments based on standardized, objective, risk prediction instruments) (Gendreau et al., 1996). They examined one hundred and thirty-one studies published between January 1970 and June 1994. In order to compare the results from the various studies involved in this meta-analysis, the authors converted the available statistics from each study into a Pearson $r$ which measured the effect of predictors on recidivism.

This sample produced 1141 correlations. The strongest predictor domains were: criminogenic needs (i.e. changeable risk factors), criminal history, history of anti-social behaviour, social achievement, age, gender, race, and family factors. Criminal history ($M_r=.16$)\(^2\) and criminogenic needs ($M_r=.17$) were found to be significantly stronger predictor domains than predictors such as family factors ($M_r=.12$), intellectual functioning ($M_r=.07$), personal distress ($M_r=.06$), and socioeconomic status ($M_r=.06$). In addition, the mean $r$ values for dynamic risk factors ($M_r=.15$) were significantly stronger than those for static risk

\(^2\) $M_r$ is the mean correlations.
factors ($M_r=.12$). The Level of Service Inventory-Revised (LSI-R) was found to be the most useful actuarial measure, compared to the SFS$^3$ and Wisconsin$^4$. The measurement of predictors using the LSI-R produced the strongest correlations with rates of recidivism ($M_r=.35$) compared to the SFS ($M_r=.29$) and Wisconsin ($M_r=.27$) (Gendreau et al., 1996).

Izzo and Ross (1990) conducted a meta-analysis of rehabilitation programs catering to juvenile delinquents. They categorized the studies they used based on their conceptualization (i.e. theoretical model) of anti-social behavior and the consequent program rationale (i.e. Social Learning Theory, behaviour modification, modeling theory). They included forty-six published studies on juvenile treatment programs conducted between 1970 and 1985. How criminal behaviour was conceptualized, and consequently the goal, targets and content of the program, were found to be the key factors for whether a program was successful or not in its goals. Programs based on deterrence models, punishment models, medical/disease models, and explanatory models that stressed outside influences such as poverty or culture conflict were found to have weak effects on recidivism. Programs based on cognitive models (i.e. Social Learning Theory) were found to be twice as effective as noncognitive-based programs. Cognitive programs included techniques that "foster the development of the offender's thinking and reasoning skills, social perceptions, and problem-solving skills" (Izzo & Ross, 1990: 139). In addition, having both a cognitive component in a program and a community-based, rather than an institutional-based, program had

---

$^3$SFS is the Salient Factor Score actuarial measurement instrument.

$^4$Wisconsin is the Wisconsin Assessment of Client Risk Scale actuarial measurement instrument.
significant influences on the size of the effect on recidivism. Based on these results, Izzo and Ross concluded that, for young offenders, program focus should be on how offenders think. Furthermore, Izzo and Ross’ findings support the conclusion that theoretically based programs have rates of effectiveness that are five times more successful than programs lacking a theoretical foundation (1990).

The meta-analysis of juvenile treatments conducted by Whitehead and Lab (1989) produced a more negative outlook on all types of rehabilitation programs when compared to the previous studies that have been reviewed. The objective of their research was to investigate which correctional treatments for juveniles produced a positive impact on rates of recidivism. These researchers included fifty articles from professional journals that evaluated juvenile correctional treatments and recidivism published between 1975 and 1984. To produce a common ground for comparison, all statistics used in the studies were converted into two common statistics: chi-square and phi. The authors found that no positive effects on rates of recidivism emerged from any form of intervention, including no results that supported behavioural interventions being superior to other interventions for reducing recidivism (Whitehead & Lab. 1989).

Whitehead and Labs’ (1989) results are contradictory to those reported by Izzo and Ross (1990): of note is that no studies reviewed by Whitehead and Lab overlap with the studies reviewed in the research conducted by Izzo and Ross, even though their research was conducted during the same time span. Furthermore, Whitehead and Lab fail to include the content of their reviewed programs and none was cognitive-based. The one area of program content the researchers did identify was “behavioural interventions”. however none were
cognitive in nature. They included: using contingency management, skills training and behaviour contracting, token economies, or those simply labeled as behavioural interventions. Consequently, Whitehead and Lab's study supports the conclusion that non-cognitive-based programs are unsuccessful, and the research is silent on cognitive-based programs. Whitehead and Labs' findings do suggest that of the programs they reviewed, system diversion may be the most promising for reducing rates of recidivism (1989).

What emerges from these meta-analyses is support for cognitive-based programs that address criminogenic needs, and altered thinking, attitudes, values and belief systems. These programs are grounded theoretically, typically in Social Learning Theory, and have a higher success rate for positive outcomes for reducing recidivism and developing pro-social attitudes (Andrews, 1989; Gendreau et al., 1996; Izzo & Ross, 1990; Bonta, 1997). Recent findings suggest that non-cognitive-based programs that lack a strong theoretical foundation, or include deterrence or punishment models are less successful (Gendreau et al., 1996; Izzo & Ross, 1990; Whitehead & Lab. 1989).

Treatment and Program Focus Review

Recidivism and Programming

Six articles were found that address the risk domains predictive of offender recidivism (Brown, 1998; Motiuk, 1998; Gendreau & Goggin, 1996; Andrews, 1989; 1996; Taylor, 1998). All six articles report the results of research conducted on rehabilitation programs and their association with recidivism. In addition, all six articles report specific recommendations from research results, for effective offender assessment and treatment to reduce or predict rates of recidivism upon release or conditional release into the community.
Five of the six articles were published between 1996 and 1998 (Brown. 1998; Motiuk. 1998; Gendreau & Goggin. 1996; Andrews. 1996; Taylor. 1998). The remaining article was published in 1989 (Andrews. 1989), however an update on this article, published in 1996 (Andrews. 1996), is included in this literature review. All six articles report on Canadian programs, treatments and assessments. Two of the articles outline the significance of the Correctional Services of Canada's Offender Intake Assessment (OIA), and the Case Needs Identification and Analysis (CNIA) element of the OIA. focusing on the predictive role of dynamic factors on recidivism in risk assessments (Brown. 1998; Motiuk. 1998). The remaining four articles discuss what treatment and programming should focus on in order to be effective in reducing recidivism (Gendreau & Goggin. 1996; Andrews. 1989; 1996; Taylor. 1998).

Brown (1998) and Motiuk (1998) both conclude from their research that there is a clear relationship between seven dynamic risk domains (employment, marital/family, associates, substance abuse, community functioning, personal/emotional, attitude) and recidivism, and therefore that offender need domains should be the focus of correctional interventions (i.e. programs, treatment). In the first article, Brown reports the results and recommendations from a literature review of meta-analyses and the CNIA predictive outcome study conducted by the Research Branch of the Correctional Services of Canada. This research, called the Case Needs Review Project, was in response to the Correctional Services Task Force Report on Offender Reintegration. The report called for a review of the CNIA segment of the OIA process to evaluate the relevancy of the CNIA assessment domains in identifying and prioritizing offender needs associated with criminal behaviour.
Brown concludes that both the outcome study findings and the literature review findings verify the relationship between the seven offender risk domains and recidivism. He states that there were moderate to strong correlations with recidivism for most of the predictor domains. Brown reports that the three domains (of the original seven) with the strongest predictive ability were attitudes, associates, and substance abuse (1998). In the second article, Motiuk outlines the significance of focusing on dynamic risk factors from the onset of offender admission to the correctional system. Motiuk’s research, as does Brown’s, focuses on the OIA process involving criminal risk assessment, and the CNIA. Motiuk’s study involved follow-up assessments of 3,380 male offenders who had been through the Canadian federal system and administered the OIA-CNIA process. The purpose of the study was to determine the most successful predictors of post-release outcome. Of the original seven risk domains, he found that the strongest predictors of behaviour upon release were (in order of strength): employment, substance abuse, associates, marital/family, and personal/emotional (1998). Due to the predictive relationship found between offender risk domains and recidivism, Motiuk also supports the use of dynamic risk factors in offender assessment instruments as reliable predictors of offender behaviour upon release (1998).

Gendreau and Goggin (1996). Andrews (1989; 1996), and Taylor (1998) also conclude that the most effective programs in reducing offender recidivism are those that target criminogenic needs (dynamic risk factors). Gendreau and Goggin conducted a literature review of meta-analyses that have studied correctional treatment, and provide a summary of the key findings that emerged. The researchers outline three basic principles of productive correctional intervention: 1) assessment factors (actuarial method assessing a
variety of static and dynamic factors). 2) treatment characteristics (behavioural based, substantial length, multi-model, target criminogenic needs of the offender), and 3) system factors (trained, experienced, credible staff with counseling skills) (1996). Gendreau and Goggin state that for programming to be optimally effective, the treatment must be behaviourally based and highly structured while focusing on offender criminogenic needs (attitudes, values, and behaviours) (1996).

Andrews' 1989 article offers a summary literature review of research on risk, need, and offender characteristics. Based on this review, he outlines three main results concerning correctional treatment and programming: 1) higher-risk offenders are more positively affected by treatment than low-risk offenders. 2) treatment should specifically target the criminogenic needs of the offenders participating, and 3) treatments need to correspond to the characteristics and circumstances of the offenders participating. In 1996 Andrews updated his 1989 literature review reviewing materials from 1989 to 1996 and concluded "that the evidentiary support for offender programming has not lessened since 1989" (Andrews, 1996: 44).

Taylor conducted a literature review to examine the value of offender need evaluation in risk assessment (1998). He put forth three main results of his research: 1) the criminal history (static) domain of an offender is a strong predictor of recidivism, 2) a consistent relationship exists between the number and the class of dynamic risk domains and recidivism, and 3) predicting offender recidivism is stronger if both static and dynamic risk domains are assessed. Taylor also supports the use of actuarial assessment tools and programs that are risk domain specific to the offenders participating (1998).
Domains Predictive of Recidivism

Seven articles were found that measure dynamic risk domains (employment, association, substance abuse, attitude, community involvement, family, personal and emotional) in terms of their ability to predict offender recidivism and criminal behaviour (Gendreau et al., 1998; Goggin et al., 1998; Dowden & Brown, 1998; Law, 1998; Gates et al., 1998; Paolucci et al., 1998; Robinson et al., 1998). Five articles report results from meta-analyses conducted on risk domains (Gendreau et al., 1998; Goggin et al., 1998; Dowden & Brown, 1998; Law, 1998; Gates et al., 1998). The remaining two articles are literature reviews (empirical and theoretical) summarizing risk domain relationships to adult criminal recidivism (Paolucci et al., 1998; Robinson et al., 1998). All seven articles address the predictive relationship between the measured risk domain and adult criminal behaviour and recidivism.

All seven articles were published in the Forum on Corrections Research in 1998 and were conducted in response to the recommendation of the Correctional Service of Canada’s Task Force on Reintegration that the Case Needs Identification and Analysis (CNIA) instrument be evaluated to “ensure it identifies and prioritizes only those offender needs related to criminal behaviour” (Gates et al., 1998: 35). The authors all offer their recommendations as to which risk domains produce the strongest predictive power for adult criminal behaviour and recidivism, thus which domains are useful predictors for the CNIA.

In the five articles reporting results from meta-analyses, the sample sizes ranged from 20 (Gates et al., 1998) to 67 (Gendreau et al., 1998) studies each. The two articles that focus on literature review report their research to include 238 (Paolucci et al., 1998) to “several
hundred" (Robinson et al., 1998) research studies and relevant references.

Gendreau, Goggin, and Gray conducted their research on the risk domain ‘employment’ (1998). Sixty-seven studies were chosen for their meta-analysis, which generated 200 effects on recidivism (Gendreau et al., 1998). The authors’ goals were to research the predictive relationship of employment to criminal behaviour and recidivism. Within the employment domain there were seven categories evaluated: employment history, employment needs at discharge, employment status at intake, financial, education/employment, school achievement, and school maladjustment. The results of the research indicate the education/employment category (\(M_r = .26\))\(^5\) to be the most significant predictor of criminal behaviour, followed by employment needs at discharge (\(M_r = .15\)), and employment history (\(M_r = .14\)). Therefore, Gendreau et al. report that the employment domain is a moderately strong predictor of offender recidivism (1998).

Goggin, Gendreau, and Gray conducted a meta-analysis on the relationship between the risk domain ‘associates and social interaction’ (1998). Their sample size was 35 studies that produced 75 effects on recidivism (Goggin et al., 1998). Goggin et al. researched the predictive ability of associates and social interaction to criminal behaviour and recidivism (1998). The associates risk domain included three categories to be evaluated: association with criminal companions, crime neighbourhood, and criminal family. The researchers reported that association with criminal companions (\(M_r = .19\)) was found to be the strongest predictor of recidivism, followed by criminal family (\(M_r = .17\)), and crime neighbourhood

\(^5\)\(M_r\) is the mean correlation.
(Mr=12). Thus, the associates and social interaction risk domain were recommended to be the most powerful predictors for criminal behaviour and recidivism.

Dowden and Brown conducted a meta-analysis on the predictive competency of the risk domain 'substance abuse' on criminal behaviour and recidivism (1998). The sample size for their meta-analysis was 45 studies yielding 116 effects on recidivism (Dowden & Brown, 1998). For this study, substance abuse risk domain involved five categories to be assessed: alcohol abuse problem, drug abuse problem, alcohol and/or drug abuse problem, substance abuse related to past or current charge, and parents were substance abusers. They found the category of alcohol and/or drug abuse problem (Mr=22) to be the strongest predictor of recidivism, followed by drug abuse problem (Mr=18), parental substance abuse (Mr=13), and alcohol abuse problem (Mr=11). Based on these results, the researchers report that the substance abuse risk domain demonstrates a moderate to strong relationship with criminal behaviour and recidivism.

Law's article reports findings of a meta-analysis on the risk domain 'attitude' and the predictive capacity of recidivism and criminal behaviour (1998). Law's meta-analysis involved 32 studies producing 112 effects on recidivism. For this research, the attitude domain was divided into five categories: justice, society, property, violence, and lifestyle. The results of this research report that mean correlations for these categories ranged from .15 to .18 and the authors report these correlations as moderately related to recidivism (1998).

Gates, Dowden, and Brown researched the predictive strength of the risk domain 'community functioning' in relation to criminal behaviour and recidivism (1998). The
researchers conducted a meta-analysis on this relationship from 20 studies generating 79 effects on recidivism (1998). The community functioning risk domain was divided into eight categories for evaluation: accommodation, deportment, health, finance, leisure, support, living companions, and childhood community functioning (1998). This research supports the conclusion that leisure ($M_r = .20$), finance ($M_r = .19$), accommodation ($M_r = .19$), and support ($M_r = .12$) are the categories within the domain of community functioning that present the strongest predictors of recidivism (1998). The researchers refer to these as moderate to strong predictors of criminal behaviour and recidivism (1998).

Paolucci, Violato, and Schofield conducted a literature review of research studies to investigate the predictive value of the risk domain 'marital and family' to recidivism and criminal behaviour (1998). In their research there were 238 studies reviewed for theoretical and methodological applications and empirical results. The risk domain marital and family is separated into five categories: family psychopathology, attachment and parent-child relationship, child abuse, family structure and birth order, and marital relationship. The researchers failed to report a comparable breakdown of results, as was found with the meta-analyses, however the following categories were listed as family factors that have been involved as predictors of future criminal behaviour: "family psychopathology, quality of parent-child relationships, experiences of childhood victimization, and marital status and quality of relationship" (Paolucci. 1998: 22). Paolucci et al. conclude by stating that upholding positive relationships with family 'may' reduce recidivism (1998). Further research is needed for this domain area for stronger conclusive statements to be made.
Finally, Robinson, Porporino, and Beal conducted an empirical and theoretical literature review on the risk domain 'personal and emotional orientation' and the association with criminal behaviour and recidivism (1998). The researchers "identified several hundred relevant references" for their examination of the literature (Robinson, 1998: 38). The personal and emotional orientation domain included five components: self-concept, cognition, behavioural, mental ability and mental health, and interventions (1998). Robinson et al. recommended that the personal and emotional need domain would be most thoroughly utilized as a predictor domain through four principle categories: cognitive (problem solving skills, thinking styles), self-control (impulsivity, life planning deficits), interpersonal (interpersonal problem solving, empathy), and aggression (aggressive tendencies, anger). The researchers reported that these four categories were the strongest indicators of recidivism and criminal behaviour found in their literature review.

In summary, all seven articles reported findings on research conducted in the area of risk/need domains. Seven risk domains were investigated to assess their predictive value of criminal behaviour and recidivism: employment, associates and social interaction, substance abuse, attitude, community functioning, marital and family, and personal and emotional orientation. All domains, with the exception of marital and family (due to methodological flaws in the review), were reported to have a moderate to strong relationship with recidivism and criminal behaviour. The researchers offered a variety of recommendations for which risk domain categories within their risk domains represent the strongest predictive link to recidivism. Overall, the seven outlined risk domains represent a comprehensive assessment to predict criminal behaviour in adult offenders.
Theoretical Orientation for Rehabilitation Programs Review

James Bonta presented an article in a 1997 issue of the Forum on Corrections Research that briefly discussed how and why theoretical orientations are pertinent to offender risk assessments. The Canadian Correctional Service relies on risk assessment for decisions on offender classification (i.e. institutional placement, parole, community release, supervision). With risk assessment being at the forefront of offender classification decisions, it is understandable that continuous improvement in this area is important. The issue that Bonta addressed is why and how theory is an important addition to risk assessments that have been utilized in the past (1997).

Some atheoretical actuarial risk scales have been successful in the prediction of recidivism and criminal behaviour (e.g. Statistical Information on Recidivism - SIR). However such risk scales fail to answer the question of why certain factors are found to be predictive of recidivism, or why certain variables are related to criminal behaviour (Bonta, 1997). A second weakness of atheoretical risk scales is their reliance on static factors rather than dynamic factors, thus providing us information on recidivism prediction but failing to provide information on changeable areas in which intervention is possible to reduce offender risk (Bonta, 1997). With these two areas of limitation outlined, the addition of theory allows a solution to the problem while retaining the successful aspects already established in the risk scales.

Bonta purports that most theories can be generalized into three perspectives of crime: sociological perspective, clinical perspective, and a social learning approach (1997). Sociological theories generally view crime as a result of social, political and economic factors, whereas clinical theories view crime as being rooted within the individual. Both
sociological and clinical theories offer valid explanations of crime, however they focus on static (i.e. unchangeable, from the past) risk factors. A social learning approach (Bonta refers to this as a general personality and social psychological perspective) claims that criminal behaviour is a learned behaviour and an array of factors must be considered and identified to understand why an offender commits crime.

A social learning approach incorporates both sociological and clinical theory while considering a variety of other factors as predictor domains, resulting in a thorough offender risk assessment process involving both static and dynamic factors (Bonta, 1997). By incorporating both static and dynamic risk domains during offender assessment, prediction of recidivism is being retained while information is being provided that will direct for treatment of offender needs to reduce future criminal behaviour.

The inclusion of theory in offender risk assessment is increasing in importance. Although sociological and clinical theories are important to consider. Bonta claims that a social learning approach provides a more thorough approach to risk assessment by considering a wide variety of factors associated with criminal behaviour and recidivism (1997). In an era that is rapidly embracing rehabilitation and treatment programs as an alternative to deterrence and punishment in reducing the risk of recidivism, it is essential that correction services have information available to make sound decisions about offenders. Social learning approaches indicate that the offender domains of criminal history, anti-social supports, anti-social thinking and anti-social personality be assessed in making these decisions (Bonta, 1997). By combining these three dynamic risk factors along with the static factor of criminal history, Bonta projects that they can act as targets in treatment programs designed to reduce the risk of recidivism. Furthermore, Social Learning Theory offers
information on offender need domains that may assist in the development of treatment and programs that may reduce criminal behaviour.

**Measurement Instruments Review**

Bonta and Andrews provide a detailed overview of the Level of Supervision Inventory (LSI) offender classification instrument beginning with a description of the LSI, the origins, and how the LSI is implemented and utilized within the Canadian Correction Systems (1993). The authors continue by providing a brief summary of empirical validation of the LSI and the results of the research.

A group of correctional workers (practitioners, managers, probation officers) and Carleton University researchers gathered in the late 1970's to create a risk classification instrument that was systematic and objective in nature (Bonta & Andrews, 1993). The product of their efforts became the LSI and included offender information pertinent for making treatment and risk decisions about the offender, that could be quantified, and that could be assessed by correctional workers. The LSI included ten risk domains that involved several subcategory items, representing and documenting factors that are associated with criminal conduct. The LSI information was gathered through a structured interview and verified through offender files and outside correctional sources. The LSI included both static (unchangeable) and dynamic (changeable) risk factors that were scored either "0" or "1" indicating presence or absence of the item for the offender, with summative scores calculated for each domain. The higher the offender scored on the LSI, the greater the chance the offender would recidivate, therefore this classification instrument was seen to be useful for its summation of factors that could indicate what treatment or correctional placement decisions were needed for the offenders.
The LSI appeared to be an excellent tool to predict offender recidivism (and thus treatment needs), however empirical validation was required to assess its merit. Researchers (Andrews. 1982: Andrews & Robinson. 1984; Bonta. 1989; Bonta & Motiuk. 1990; Bonta & Motiuk. 1992) began to test the validity of the LSI on offenders at various levels in the corrections system (Bonta & Andrews. 1993). The research results indicated that the LSI was useful for the prediction of offender recidivism and for evaluating the effects that treatment had on offenders. The Ministry of Correctional Services of Ontario was persuaded by the research that was conducted, and accepted the LSI as their assessment instrument for the supervision of offenders on parole and probation. The LSI-R remains the classification instrument for the Ontario Ministry of Correctional Services for parolees and probationers.

Motiuk (1993) used success in a half-way house program as his criterion variable to assess the predictive validity of the Level of Supervision Inventory (LSI) in comparison to six other classification instruments. The quality of an evaluation is based, to a great degree, on the validation of the measurements used. Since recidivism requires relatively long-term longitudinal research, it is difficult to fully assess the predictive validity of instruments used in rehabilitation programs. Motiuk used a sample of 102 adult males serving between four months and two years in prison who were transferred to a half-way-house. All offenders were administered the LSI upon admission and file information was taken in order to score them on the Wisconsin Assessment of Client Risk Scale (WISCONSIN), Illinois Initial Risk Evaluation Scale (ILLINOIS), Statistical Information on Recidivism Scale (SIR), Salient Factor Score (SFS), Oregon Parole Prognosis Scale (OREGON), and the Pennsylvania Parole Prognosis Assessment Scale (PENNSYLVANIA) (Motiuk, 1993). Motiuk found that the LSI was the most accurate instrument for identifying offenders who failed in a half-way-
house. It correctly identified 87.0% of the failures compared to WISCONSIN 65.2%, ILLINOIS 82.6%, SIR 82.6%, SFS 82.6%, OREGON 73.9%, and PENNSYLVANIA 73.9%

Motiuk concluded that classification devices such as the LSI that indicate both static (e.g. criminal past) and dynamic risk factors (e.g. attitudes, employment) were more successful in predicting success and failure compared to instruments which involve a limited number of variables, or instruments which focused strictly on criminal history. These results provide some support for the short-term predictive validity of the LSI, though it must be recognized that the instrument may or may not also have predictive validity for offenders who do not participate in a half-way house program or for recidivism over the long-term.

Conclusions

Until recently, there has been a general understanding that rehabilitation programs are not as effective as deterrence and punishment (e.g. Whitehead & Lab. 1989). However as seen through this literature review, correctional researchers and practitioners are rapidly producing a base of research that supports the success of rehabilitation programs in various areas, including rates of recidivism for program participants (Andrews. 1989; 1996; Gendreau & Goggin. 1996; Gendreau et al., 1996; Izzo & Ross. 1990; Bonta. 1989). There is a strong consensus emerging from research conducted by Correctional Services Canada that cognitive programs are the most successful rehabilitation programs, and that dynamic risk factors (as opposed to static risk factors) are the most effective targets for treatment (Bonta. 1989; Gendreau et al., 1996; Izzo & Ross. 1990). There is also a general agreement in the literature that behavioural-based programs that are highly structured, and focus on the criminogenic attitudes, values and behaviours of high risk offenders (i.e. those considered most likely to re-offend) are the most likely to succeed in achieving program objectives and

While several of these are theoretically grounded. it is believed that they are less effective because they fail to train offenders in techniques that encourage the development of social perception. thinking and reasoning skills. and problem solving skills. all of which have been shown to be the most successful program route for decreasing the chance of re-offending.

The Social Learning Theory. and in particular Differential Association-Reinforcement Theory. provide explanatory models for how and why such programs work.
COUNTER-POINT PROGRAM

Counter-Point is a community-based rehabilitation program (versus institutional-based) that is held in the John Howard Society of Hamilton-Wentworth (JHS) small groups room in Hamilton, Ontario. Each Counter-Point program has approximately eight participants and lasts for the duration of two months. The program was designed to intervene with high-risk (i.e. those most likely to re-offend) male offenders. Program participants are referred to the JHS from probation/parole officers as a condition of release from a correctional facility, therefore all participants have been incarcerated and all participants are currently living in either their own homes or in court assigned group homes.

Counter-Point uses a cognitive-behavioural approach to assist people to change how they think and behave. The program description in the Counter-Point manual outlines seven basic goals (refer to Appendix III):

1) Enhance client willingness to alter criminal attitudes and behaviours via motivational techniques.

2) Provide participants with skills necessary to identify and challenge pro-criminal attitudes.

3) Assist participants to develop and adopt pro-social attitudes.

4) Provide participants with the self-regulation and self-management skills to ensure attitudinal and behavioural change.

5) Assist participants to identify high-risk situations and develop necessary resources to prevent future criminal behaviour.

6) Increase personal responsibility and accountability by developing empathy and perspective taking skills.

7) Encourage access into pro-social activities.
There are seven modules that are administered by the JHS staff throughout the two-month program. These are titled: 1) setting the context for change, 2) attitudes that support criminal behaviour. 3) altering anti-social attitudes. 4) pro-social problem solving. 5) victim awareness. 6) maintaining change. and 7) booster sessions (Counter-Point Program Manual). The JHS staff who facilitate Counter-Point are trained for the program through a contract with Correctional Services Canada. The facilitators of the program are trained in Social Learning Theory, cognitive-behavioural intervention strategies. and group dynamics (refer to Appendix III). All program facilitators are experienced in working with a wide range of offender clients. They regularly participate in team meetings and clinical supervision. and are expected to strictly adhere to standards of professional conduct (refer to Appendix III).

The program design for Counter-Point has three forms of evaluation built into it: 1) comparison of pre and post assessments. 2) ongoing process evaluation. and 3) tracking of recidivism (refer to Appendix III). The Level of Service Inventory-Revised (LSI-R) is the risk assessment tool used in the pre- and post-program evaluations. It is a standardized test that gathers offender information on fifty-four indicators (i.e. items) which comprise ten scales (each measuring a separate domain) considered relevant to predicting recidivism (Appendix II). Ongoing process evaluation consists of reports of offender progress in relation to the program’s target areas. Progress is documented in file reports during the two month program. Finally, rates of recidivism for program participants are maintained by agencies that supervise participants (i.e. parole or probation) once they complete the program.
Observations of Counter-Point

Throughout the four sessions of Counter-Point which I observed, I was continually impressed with the depth of conversation and investigation that the facilitator and the group engaged in concerning the participants’ criminal behaviour and the underlying thought processes and values that were relevant to the actions. I found the participants to be very open about their actions and during discussion they seemed to be very forthcoming with addressing the various explanations, consequences, and alternative solutions to their situations. The facilitator conducted the sessions on a step by step basis, meaning that the group was taken through a series of steps to disclose their actions, the meaning of their actions, attitudes that supported such actions, consequences, and alternative solutions. Throughout the various steps, the facilitator continuously applied explanations based on cognitive theory to their discussion in order to assist the participants in understanding the diverse situations that they encountered, thus allowing the participants to view their circumstances from various angles.
RESEARCH METHOD

This research used the LSI-R to assess changes in several dynamic domains found in research to be predictive of recidivism among adult male offenders. Assessments of those domains were documented at entry and exit from the Counter-Point program.

In planning this program evaluation, I took certain measures for my initial entry into this research setting. A written agreement was made with the Executive Director of the John Howard Society of Hamilton-Wentworth to conduct this evaluation of Counter-Point (refer to Appendix IV). This agreement acted as a contract between the JHS and the researcher. It outlined the purpose of the research, the guidelines of the evaluation, issues related to consent, ethical considerations, all other relevant information concerning the evaluation procedure, and the roles of the personnel involved in the research and the program. In this way, I obtained permission from the JHS to access offender file information and to observe group sessions. In accessing these files I was bound by the confidentiality standards used by the JHS (refer to Appendix VA).

I worked with the John Howard Society staff to attain a common and clear understanding of the goals and objectives of the program. During the evaluation I measured the degree to which these goals and objectives were achieved through completion of a pre- and post-program instrument for each participant in Counter-Point. Once I measured these focal areas of the program, I examined in greater detail the targeted areas in which the program has been most and least successful.

I have worked with the JHS of Hamilton-Wentworth Executive Director and the Counter-Point program facilitator in the planning stages of the evaluation. The Executive Director expressed great interest in this evaluation, and was open to suggestions or
improvements for Counter-Point and documentation for whether the program was successful in its objectives, based on the pre-post LSI-R scores. The JHS of Hamilton-Wentworth has complete control of how and where the information from this thesis is used within their organization.

Design

This study consisted of a single-group pre-post assessment design. Pre- and post-assessments of each Counter-Point participant were conducted using the Level of Service Inventory-Revised. According to Rossi and Freeman (1982) this design is a ‘shadow control’. The participants were assessed before entering the program, and again after the program was completed by the program facilitator and the researcher using file information and the facilitator’s knowledge of the participants, the program, and the LSI-R requirements. There is no control group in this research.

Population and Sample

The sample for this research consisted of forty-four male federal criminal offenders between 20 and 50 years of age who were assigned to Counter-Point following release from prison as part of their parole or probation fulfillment. These offenders attended one of ten separate Counter-Point sessions: July to September 1999. April to June 1999. January to March 1999. October to December 1998. July to September 1998. April to June 1998. January to March 1998. October to December 1997. July to September 1997. and April to June 1997. LSI-R data were available for all sessions.

Data Collection - Level of Service Inventory-Revised

The LSI-R is a standardized instrument used to gather information about each participant. The John Howard Society LSI-R Needs Assessment consists of fifty-four items
across ten separate categories representing major risk or need areas as supported by research on recidivism. These include: 1) criminal history (Appendix III: A1-10), 2) education/employment (B11-20), 3) financial (C21-22), 4) family/marital (D23-26), 5) accommodation (E27-29), 6) leisure/recreation (F30-31), 7) companions (G32-36), 8) alcohol/drug problem (H37-45), 9) emotional/personal (I46-50), and 10) attitudes/orientation (J51-54) (JHS Needs Assessment Scoring Guide). These variables were coded using the LSI-R coding manual.

The LSI-R was designed as an interview to be conducted with outside agents (facilitator/case worker and government agents including parole/probation officers, former case workers, psychologists, and police who include information in offender files). For this evaluation, the LSI-R measures were compiled using existing participant files and the knowledge and judgement of the program facilitator at two time points: 1) before the participant began Counter-Point, and 2) after the program was completed (refer to Appendix II). While using existing files and facilitator information introduced a potential bias, this was the only method of gathering data given that this evaluation was based on participants who had already completed the program.

**Variables**

It is necessary here to outline the distinction between static and dynamic risk factors. Static risk factors include variables that are a product of the offender’s history, such as criminal past (Gendreau et al., 1996), are unchangeable, and produce a persistent ‘pressure’ toward continuing criminal behaviour. Dynamic risk factors are those that are changeable such as values, attitudes and beliefs (Gendreau et al., 1996). They are referred to in the literature as criminogenic needs. Together, static and dynamic risk factors produce a degree
of risk of re-offense. The measurement instrument for this thesis, the LSI-R, includes ten predictor domains which cover both static (unchangeable) and dynamic (changeable) factors.

The variables examined for change in this study were the specific dynamic variables measured in the LSI-R: leisure/recreation activities, pro-criminal verses pro-social companions, alcohol and drug use, emotional or personal stability, and attitude or orientation. Other variables measured for change, although to a lesser extent since the program is only two months long and these typically take longer to change, include: education and employment, financial situation, marital situation, and accommodation (refer to Appendix II). Positive changes in these dynamic factors are indicators that the participants achieved program objectives/goals and of effective program administration. Some examples of positive change in these variables include becoming employed, increased family satisfaction, increased financial stability, increased emotional stability, and signs of improvement with a drug or alcohol addiction.

Outline of Planned Statistical Procedures

SPSS was used for the data analysis. Following coding guidelines for the LSI-R, the fifty-four indicators were coded on a dichotomous nominal scale of 0 and 1 (indicating absence or presence). Scales were constructed using the individual indicators for the following ten life domains: criminal history, education/employment, finance, family/marital, accommodation, leisure/recreation, companions, alcohol/drug problem, emotional/personal, and attitudes/orientation. Each scale was examined for internal consistency, its approximation to a normal distribution and range of scores. No adjustments were necessary since all approximated a normal distribution. Changes pre- to post-program were measured in three ways: 1) a series of before-after t-tests were conducted for each of the nine dynamic
life domain scales. 2) McNemar tests for the item indicators, and 3) paired sample t-test for the rating indicators. The domain paired sample t-tests were followed by univariate Anovas to assess the potential effects of the static domain of criminal history and the specific program session in which an offender participated, on changes in dynamic domain scores. Given the sample size, these analyses were conducted sequentially and Bonferroni corrections for multiple analyses were applied to insure a true alpha-level of .05.

Ethical Considerations

The setting for data gathering was the John Howard Society (JHS). With Counter-Point being a government funded program for federal offenders, confidentiality and anonymity had to be guaranteed. No identifying information or information involving names was collected as part of this research. In addition, all files were reviewed on the premises of the JHS. neither files nor identifying information left the JHS.

I observed four sessions of the Counter-Point program during the summer of 1999. I was introduced by the Counter-Point facilitator as a Master of Arts (Criminology) student at the University of Windsor conducting evaluation research on the Counter-Point program for the JHS of Hamilton-Wentworth. I explained in detail the objectives and motives of my thesis. as well as the research procedure (assessment and observation). There was a clear consensus from the group that I was welcome to sit in on a few of their sessions. I explained that I was not interested in the participants themselves, but rather that I was interested in observing the facilitator during session. in particular how the program was conducted as a group session. I chose to observe these sessions in order to improve my understanding of how the program was conducted with respect to the target areas of intervention (i.e. how the participants interacted as a group, how they unraveled their criminal experiences and applied
theory to these experiences to understand the consequences and motives behind their actions). I consider exposure to the group sessions to be significant to my understanding of the program itself. My observations have formed part of the data used to help in interpreting or reflecting on the statistical results.

The participants strictly acted as a "means" for the measurement of the success of the program and its objectives: the "end". With this in mind, I have evaluated the program through the information received from the subjects in the group that I observed, and the offender files of my sample. Since a requirement for participation in the Counter-Point program is permitting access to files for program evaluation purposes, no specific consent from participants was obtained. This evaluation is of the JHS program Counter-Point, not of program participants.

Privacy, confidentiality, and anonymity have been maintained throughout this project. These were secured by following the standards set by the John Howard Society (refer to Appendix VA) to VE for complete confidentiality documents).

The file information as well as the program sessions that I reviewed exposed me to participant names, however each participant was assigned a numerical code for purposes of this research. Since the JHS has complete information on each program participant, they also retain information that links the numerical codes with participant names. However, once data collection was completed, I no longer had access to this information. Only aggregate data, and not information about the individual participants, is reported.

Validity and Reliability

In order to ensure research accuracy, two areas must be investigated and addressed: reliability and validity. Reliability refers to the extent that a measurement procedure can or
will result in the same findings whenever and wherever it is used (Kirk & Miller, 1986). Therefore, the consistency of the measurements used and the ability to repeat findings are essential when conducting research. As long as the measurement is used in a proper manner, the same or similar results should occur when replication is conducted. As presented in the literature review, the LSI-R has been used as a measurement procedure numerous times over the last decade and has proved itself to be a reliable tool for gathering information that produces similar results when replicated in research (Gendreau et al., 1996; Bonta & Andrews, 1993; Motiuk, 1993). The program facilitator completed the training course for using the LSI-R. She taught the procedure to me and we compiled the information for the LSI-R together and compared our results to insure compatibility. We achieved 90% compatibility in independent assessments and 100% after follow-up discussion of the non-compatible scores. Therefore, as supported by reviewed literature pertaining to the LSI-R and studies that have implemented the use of the LSI-R, I can state with confidence that the LSI-R maintained high reliability in this program evaluation research.

Validity refers to the extent to which correct answers result from the measurement through two forms of validity: internal and external. Internal validity refers to the accuracy of the information in terms of whether the researcher sees what they think they see (Kirk & Miller, 1986). This is assessed in two ways: 1) for each indicator through the comparison of my results to those of the program facilitator, and 2) for the scale measures by using Cronbach's alpha.

External validity embodies the generalizability of the research results. This research study was restricted to those male federal offenders who have been referred to the Counter-Point program at the John Howard Society of Hamilton-Wentworth. Although this study
was limited to a small sample. My findings and conclusions concerning the evaluation of the program may be generalizable to Counter-Point programs across the province offered by the JHS to the extent the programs are conducted in the same manner and are delivered to offenders with similar characteristics at all sites. Generalizability is influenced by similarities in programs and in offenders participating in the programs. The results found to be statistically significant are generalizable based on the objectives and goals, the program criteria, and the program implementation being formed from a standard foundation for all John Howard agencies across Ontario. The program evaluation results are restricted to generalizing only to future Counter-Point programs offered by trained case workers. The Counter-Point program follows entry guidelines that I have briefly outlined above, and the program maintains a strict format for modules, setting, administration/facilitation, objective/goal achievement and theoretical foundation. Therefore my findings are generalizable to future Counter-Point programs pending adherence to these formats and guidelines. The results I obtain are not generalizable to other programs due to differences that are crucial to my analysis of variables that may alter between Counter-Point and other programs.

Limitations

I lacked access to a control group for comparison. Ideal circumstances would have allowed me a group of individuals with similar characteristics but who did not participate in Counter-Point as a control group in analysis so that I could have greater certainty that results were related to the program and not merely to changes over time. As a student I was not permitted access to files or confidential information on offenders outside the Counter-Point program. Therefore my research consisted of a single group of offenders with no reference
group for comparison of outcomes. There were various confounding factors that may have also influenced results. The controls that I was able to foresee are severity of past criminal history and specific program session attended. Sex of the offender was not an issue for this evaluation since Counter-Point was an all male program. Data for each of the potential confounders were included on the LSI-R, and they were tested for potential influence on results.

Another limitation for this research was the measurement of dynamic factors. Variables such as attitude, personality, marital satisfaction or accommodation satisfaction were measured based on staff judgments from information obtained from the offender by the staff. The information gathered for the LSI-R was consistently from the facilitator of Counter-Point who scored this information based on her interpretation of the information she received from the participants about their circumstances. Therefore, the information reflects the interpretation of the facilitator rather than the participants' or anyone else's view of their circumstances. This is a recognized limitation that may reduce the validity of the research results.
RESULTS

The effectiveness of the federal offender program at the John Howard Society (JHS) of Hamilton-Wentworth called Counter-Point was evaluated by comparing scores on the LSI-R at the beginning of the program to those at the end. The two original hypotheses proposed for this evaluation research were: 1) there will be change toward pro-social attitudes and behaviours in all nine dynamic life domains, 2) the five dynamic (changeable) life domains of leisure/recreation, companions, alcohol/drug problem, emotional/personal, and attitudes/orientation will have greater change than the four dynamic domains of education/employment, financial, family/marital, and accommodation.

Hypotheses were tested using three sets of scores: domain scores, scores on specific items, and scores on rating indicators. The domain scores measured the changes in the life areas as listed in the hypotheses. The scores on specific items (0 or 1 indicating absence or presence) were tested to investigate whether some items accounted for more of a change in domains than other items. Finally, the scores on rating indicators were tested for the items that included ratings (ranges from 0 to 3). These indicated the level of performance that the offender had achieved in a particular item. Rating indicators provided a measure of how much change occurred in the item. Testing rating indicators for statistically significant change provided additional information about whether the amount of change on certain items may have accounted for changes in domain scores. This could be important information where an item did not appear to change based on its item score, but its weighting (i.e. rating indicator) changed.
Profile Summary of Participants

The sample for this research consisted of forty-four male federal criminal offenders, ranging from twenty to fifty years of age, who were assigned to Counter-Point as part of their parole or probation fulfillment following release from prison. As seen in Table 1 (page 42), most participants (59.1%) had more than a grade ten education but less than a third (29.6%) had completed high-school. Almost one third of the participants were unemployed at the onset of the program (31.8%), while almost two thirds of the participants were receiving some form of social assistance (63.6%). This is not surprising since at program entry the participants would have recently been released from a correctional institution, thus many would need to look for new employment at the time of release. Furthermore, at program entry 34.1% of the offenders were known to have a substance abuse problem: alcohol and drug problems (15.9%), alcohol problem only (4.5%), and drug problem only (13.6%) (Table 1. page 42). LSI-R data were gathered from participants from ten separate Counter-Point sessions between July 1999 and June 1997.

As seen in Table 1 (page 42), the majority of Counter-Point participants had prior adult convictions (84.1%) upon entering the program. In addition, not only were the vast majority of participants repeat offenders. 61.4% of the participants had three or more offences at the time of program entry. The number of prior convictions range from 0 to 50. There is a fairly wide spread within this range. For seven participants, the current offence is their first offence. The majority of the participants (65.9%) averaged between 0 and 10 prior adult convictions, while only 34.1% of the participants ranged from 14 to 50 prior convictions upon program entry. The median number of convictions is seven. This is consistent with entry criteria for the program that stipulate that it is for high-risk offenders.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;Grade 10 Education</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;Grade 10, &lt;Grade 12 Education</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥Grade 12 Education</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently Unemployed</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving Social Assistance</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alcohol and Drugs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Alcohol Problem Only</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Drug Problem Only</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Alcohol and Drug Problem</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criminal Offences</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Prior Adult Convictions</td>
<td>84.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ Three Present Offences</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Number Prior Convictions</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Changes Pre- to Post- Program

Changes pre- to post-program were measured in three ways: paired sample t-tests for the LSI-R domain scores, McNemar tests for the item indicators, and paired sample t-tests for the rating indicators (i.e. the variables within the domains that required a rating of 0 to 3). Bonferroni corrections were applied to each of the three sets of results to maintain a true alpha level of .05 for statistical significance. The results from each set of measures will be discussed and presented in table format in this section.

Domain Paired Sample T-Test Pre- to Post-Program

Repeat measure t-tests were run to identify domains where scores changed significantly from pre- to post-program (Table 2, page 49). The domain paired sample t-test results have been grouped from ‘very low’ to ‘very high’ in terms of the mean changes from pre- to post-program (i.e. improvement in the nine dynamic life domains of the LSI-R) for the forty-four offenders. The results were clustered by natural breaks in the statistics. To facilitate comparison of changes, all domain scores were weighted to produce scale scores that ranged from 0-10.

Changes in all nine dynamic domain scores were in the predicted direction and were statistically significant in paired t-tests at levels at or below .006 (equivalent to a true alpha of .05 with Bonferroni correction). These results support the first hypothesis, that there will be program participant change toward pro-social ends of the scale in all nine dynamic domains. These results partially support the second hypothesis that there will be greater change in attitudes and orientation, and leisure and recreational activities, and lesser change in the areas of family and marital situations, and education and employment situations. The remaining domains all showed statistically significant changes as well, however the amount
of change differed from the hypothesized results: financial, accommodation, emotional and personal, alcohol and drug problems, and companions.

As seen in Table 2 (page 49), the ‘attitudes and orientation’ (M change=5.28) domain, which is the focal target of the Counter-Point program, was the domain that demonstrated a ‘very high’ rate of change from pre- to post-program. The Counter-Point program is a cognitive-behavioural based program that targets seven program goals which are largely centred around altering each offender’s behaviour and thought processes (refer to the Counter-Point chapter for a full description). Therefore, the results for the ‘attitudes and orientation’ domain indicate that the Counter-Point program was successful in achieving its projected goals in the realm of altering program participants’ attitudes and orientations from pro-criminal to pro-social.

Three domains were categorized as having ‘high’ levels of positive change from pre-to post-program LSI-R scores: ‘financial’ (M change=2.85), ‘accommodation’ (M change=2.56), and ‘leisure and recreation’ (M change=2.50) domains. The ‘financial’ and ‘accommodation’ domains were originally hypothesized to require a longer period of time to display such promising results, or ‘high’ levels of positive change. Improvements in the areas of financial problems and living accommodations may be understood as closely connected with the overall attitudes of the participants. Willingness and the ability to accept a more pro-social perspective in the community may motivate a person to become employed and come off welfare, or improve performance in a current job, thus improving their financial situation. Positive changes in living accommodations may result from the move from a group home to the participant’s own home. The ‘leisure and recreation’ domain was hypothesized to indicate positive change within the program time span. Again closely
associated with altering the attitudes and orientations of program participants, recreational activities were expected to improve in unison with movements towards accepting a pro-social (versus pro-criminal) attitude and belief system.

‘Education and employment’ (M change=1.25) was categorized as having ‘moderate’ positive change from pre- to post-program. This life domain was hypothesized to demonstrate signs of positive change throughout the program, while taking a slightly longer period of time for dramatic changes to be seen. ‘Moderate’ change from pre- to post-testing supports that Counter-Point has been successful in forming a foundation for current and future change in the area of education and employment for the offenders. The participants have displayed modest changes during the program that may be understood as positive signs for potential future improvements.

There were four domains that resulted in ‘low’ to ‘very low’ levels of positive change: ‘family and marital’ (M change=1.08), ‘emotional and personal’ (M change=1.04), ‘alcohol and drug problem’ (M change=0.93) and ‘companions’ (M change=0.68). As expected in the original hypotheses, the ‘family and marital’ domain resulted in positive change, however to a lesser extent than other dynamic domains due to family and marital situations often requiring a longer period of time for improvements to be made. It is important to note that most of the Counter-Point participants were incarcerated for significant lengths of time, and some were living in group homes upon release. Therefore, family or marital stress and complications may ensue from the circumstances resulting from the convictions: adjusting to living at home again, the extreme emotions that may result from being homesick from one’s family and then the emotionally stressful realization of former problems resurrecting quickly, etcetera. Although positive change did result in this domain,
the offenders and their families may require a longer period of time to deal with and work through problems that are present in their lives (and producing a larger amount of change). However, the modest level of improvement that was demonstrated suggests that the participants acquired the skills and knowledge needed in this life domain to have a better understanding of how to deal with their individual situations over time.

The original hypotheses for this research included expectations for high degrees of positive change in the ‘emotional and personal’ and the ‘alcohol and drug problem’ domains. Although positive changes did occur in these two domains, the results show these changes at ‘low’ levels: ‘emotional and personal’ (M change=1.04) and ‘alcohol and drug problem’ (M change=0.93). These results indicate that Counter-Point has addressed these areas of the offenders’ lives sufficiently to influence some positive change, however these areas may require a longer period of time (than the two month program length) before dramatic improvements in the offenders’ lives are accomplished.

It was originally expected that there would be a greater level of improvement in the ‘emotional and personal’ domain from pre- to post-program LSI-R domain scores. The surprisingly low result may be interpreted in two ways: 1) the domain lacks the presence of any rating indicators to further explain or investigate more specific areas of improvement within this life domain, and 2) this domain included only five items; one of which was a static variable (mental health treatment in the past, therefore unchangeable), and one of which was a psychological assessment indicator requiring comments of a medical nature, and thus was rarely used while scoring the LSI-R (therefore providing little room for changes from pre- to post-testing). Therefore, the emotional and personal area of the offenders’ lives may not demonstrate a dramatic improvement from the beginning to the end of Counter-
Point because of the way this domain was scored. Alternatively, as with substance abuse problems, emotional and personal problems may require targeted programming of a psychological nature combined with a cognitive-behavioural based program such as Counter-Point (i.e., Counter-Point may not be enough to produce a sizable change in this area). On a general level, much of what we would consider to be emotional or personal stability may also be included in one’s attitude and orientation in life, which was the target of Counter-Point and the domain that resulted in ‘very high’ levels of improvement.

The ‘low’ level of positive change in the ‘alcohol and drug’ (M change = 0.93) domain suggests that this area of an offender’s life may require targeted (or specialized) programming for substance abuse in combination with a social skills program such as Counter-Point. The modest improvements also suggest, however, that Counter-Point had a positive impact on the participants in this area. If further investigation in this life domain results from this study, it would be beneficial to know which program participants were also in alcohol and drug rehabilitation programs while participating in a social skills program.

The ‘companions’ domain results were categorized as having ‘very low’ levels of change from pre- to post-testing. Although this domain was originally hypothesized to have high levels of change throughout the program, these results may be easily understood when taking the offenders’ living accommodations into consideration. The Counter-Point program works to develop the participants’ skills and attitudes towards pro-social friends and associates. However, the offenders’ living environments may play a vital role in their ability to alter their social groups. During the two-month program the Counter-Point participants were living in group homes or were just released from incarceration and moved back to their own homes. If living in group homes, it would be difficult to alter social companions within
a two month time frame due to living with, and attending programs with fellow offenders, thus producing an obvious situation where criminal friendships and acquaintances would develop and be difficult to break. For the participants who just recently relocated back into their home environments, they would be enveloped into their former associations and friendship circles. Although the pre- to post-testing did not show a great amount of change towards pro-social companions, the program does offer the tools necessary for the offenders to alter their situations over time. The 'very low' levels of change indicated in the results offers a sign that some positive change has occurred, and is an indication for stronger change in the future.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre- to Post- Program Change</th>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Unweighted Range</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
<th>Weighted Mean Change Scores</th>
<th>*p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesized Actual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>very high</td>
<td>attitude &amp; orientation</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>x 2.5</td>
<td>5.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>financial</td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>x 5</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>accommodation</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>x 3.33</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>leisure &amp; recreation</td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>x 5</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>mod.</td>
<td>education &amp; employment</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>x 1</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>family &amp; marital</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>x 2.5</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>emotional &amp; personal</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>x 2</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>alcohol &amp; drug problem</td>
<td>0-9</td>
<td>x 1.11</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>very low</td>
<td>companions</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>x 2</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Paired t-tests, all with df=43
Scale/Domain Items

Table 3 (page 56) presents the results of the McNemar tests of pre- and post-program score comparisons for each of the thirty-one items within the domains that allowed for potential change (i.e. excluding items of an historical nature). The McNemar results include all LSI-R items which reasonably allowed change in scores from pre- to post-testing (i.e. dynamic items only, therefore thirty-one from a possible fifty-four). These results permit us to identify the specific items on the LSI-R where change occurred. All variables were scored on a dichotomous nominal scale of ‘1’ or ‘0’ (indicating presence or absence). The overall results indicate an improvement in performance by the program participants from pre- to post-program testing on most items.

There are four ways the pre- to post-program results were assessed. The first assessment involved comparing changes from ‘poor’ to ‘good’ scores relative to all other possible outcomes using the McNemar’s test (see last column of Table 3 for significance). The second examined the percent of participants who improved based on the number who could improve, i.e. the number of participants who had ‘poor’ scores at the outset of the program as a percentage improved. (see the 3rd column of Table 3 for percentage improved). This resulted in focusing more specifically on how many of the participants who could improve actually improved. The third assessment entailed examining in detail those items where 50% or more of the participants rated ‘good’ at the pre-test scoring, i.e. ≥ 50% could not improve (columns 5 and 7 combined). This assessment looked at items where very few could improve because most were already ‘good’ at pre-test. Finally, the fourth assessment investigated which items resulted with more than 50% of the participants scoring ‘poor’ at the pre-test and ‘poor’ at the post-test (see column 6), therefore displaying no signs of change.
upon program completion.

Assessment #1

Using the Bonferroni correction. items with a p-value ≤ .002 were judged statistically significant at a true p-value of .05. All or most items in the domains that were rated as having ‘very high’. ‘high’. or ‘moderate’ changes showed statistically significant changes (‘attitudes and orientation’ M change=5.28. ‘financial’ M change=2.85. ‘accommodation’ M change=2.56. ‘leisure and recreation’ M change=2.50. and ‘education and employment’ M change=1.25). Consequently. no specific items accounted for changes in these domains. Items in the four domains found to have ‘low’ to ‘very low’ degrees of change (‘family and marital’ M change=1.08. ‘emotional and personal’ M change=1.04. ‘alcohol and drug problem’ M change=0.93. and ‘companions’ M change=0.68) had mixed results. In some domains (‘family and marital’. and ‘companions’) no items had statistically significant change. suggesting that there was a consistent absence of change across all items. In others (‘emotional and personal’. and ‘alcohol and drug problem’) some items had statistically significant changes but others were found not to be statistically significant. The ‘emotional and personal’ psychological assessments improved for a significant number of participants. In ‘alcohol and drug problems’ two indicators of problems associated with alcohol and drug use (‘marital and family’. and ‘school and work’ items) showed improvements for a significant number of participants. However none of the direct measures of ‘alcohol and drug problem’ improved significantly.
Assessment #2

It is important to note that results (column 3 in Table 4) in assessment two are based only on those offenders who were ranked "poor" (i.e. '1') at the pre-test. The percent who improved to a "good" (i.e. '0') at the post-test are evaluated as the percentage who improved. Therefore, offenders who rated "good" at the pre-test and displayed no change (i.e. "good" to "good"), or those who decreased in performance (i.e. "good" to "poor") are not considered here. The results indicate that eleven of the original thirty-one variables measured for potential change from pre- to post-program LSI-R scores produced improvements (i.e. scores improving from "poor" pre-test to "good" post-test) for ≥50% of the forty-four participants. These eleven variables were represented across five dynamic domains: "attitudes and orientation", "drug and alcohol problem", "accommodation", "companions", and "emotional and personal".

All four items representing the "attitudes and orientation" domain produced change for greater than 50% of the participants from "poor" pre-test to "good" post-test scores. These results again indicate that the size of change in the total domain score was contributed to by all four items in the domain, though somewhat more-so by the first two items (attitudes toward sentence, and attitudes towards supervision) with over 70% improved, than the last item (supportive of crime) with 57% improved. Four of the seven items in the "alcohol and drug problem" domain were found to have greater than 50% improvements, suggesting that despite the comparatively poor showing on the "alcohol and drug problem" domain scores, there are improvements in the area of substance abuse for a sizable proportion of the program participants who began with poor scores, and therefore that the domain scores may not fully represent the improvements in this area. In the "accommodation" domain, accommodation
satisfaction improved for more than 50% of the participants, which could be attributed to relocation from a correctional institution to a group-home or a private home. In the ‘companions’ domain, two of the three participants who had no anti-criminal friends at the start of the program improved to a rating of ‘good’ at the end of the program, indicating improvement for the two participants concerning developing friendships with individuals who are anti-criminal. Finally, five of the ten participants whose emotions severely interfered with their daily functioning at the start of the program improved from a ‘poor’ pre-test score to a ‘good’ post-test score upon program completion. These results suggest that some of the less than satisfactory results on domain scores may be a result of the small number of participants who were able to improve, i.e. who had poor scores at program start. However, in some cases high percentages of these few participants did actually improve, supporting a claim of program success.

Assessment #3

The third set of assessments required more detailed investigation of items where 22-44 (i.e. 50%-100%) of the participants rated ‘good’ on the pre-test, and therefore could not improve their scores. These participants restricted the ability of the McNemar test to find a statistically significant change. There were a total of ten items where 50% or more of the participants were not able to improve their scores. These ten items were found within four domains: ‘family and marital’, ‘companions’, ‘alcohol and drug problem’, and ‘emotional and personal’.

The reason for the lack of a large improvement in the ‘alcohol and drug problem’ domain score is evident here. On six of the seven items in this domain, 50% or more of the
participants began with 'good' scores, thus limiting the possibility for overall group improvement. Similarly, in the 'companions' domain, on two of the three items, 50% or more of the participants were rated 'good' on their pre-program test, thus restricting the amount of potential group improvement.

Assessment #4

From the original thirty-one items, four items across four domains resulted in above 50% of the participants rating 'poor' at LSI-R pre-testing and remaining 'poor' at the post-testing. More than half of the participants displayed no signs of positive change throughout the Counter-Point program on the following four items: some criminal friends ('companions' domain), law violations ('drug and alcohol problem' domain), moderate influence ('emotional and personal' domain), and high-crime neighbourhood ('accommodation' domain).

To begin, three of the four items (moderate interference, law violations, and some criminal friends) are found within the three domains that resulted in the lowest improvements in domain scores ('emotional and personal', 'alcohol and drug problem', and 'companions'). The fourth item, high-crime neighbourhood, was an item within the 'accommodation' domain. Although the 'accommodation' domain rated 'high' for signs of positive changes in pre- to post-testing in domain scores, it is not surprising that this individual item showed positive changes for very few participants. It is necessary to take into consideration that most of the program participants were living in group homes for the duration of the Counter-Point program. Therefore changes in living in high-crime neighbourhoods may have been out of the realm of control for the offenders.
Scale/Domain Items Summary

Overall, the item analysis results indicated that: all or most items represented in the domains that produced 'very high', 'high' and 'moderate' changes in the paired t-test results for the domain scores were found to have statistically significant changes. The items represented in the domains found to have 'low' to 'very low' score changes resulted in a mix of statistically significant and not statistically significant changes.

These more detailed assessments of item scores provided information that supplemented and, in some cases, helped explain domain score results. For the 'alcohol and drug problem' and 'companions' domains we see that most participants had good scores at the outset, and high percentages of the small number of participants with initial poor scores improved. This explains the low overall change score and lends support to the original hypothesis two. For the 'emotional and personal' domain, the 'moderate interference' item was noticeably the item that drastically decreased the amount of change from pre- to post-program domain scores, which is a promising result seeing as moderate interference is less problematic than severe interference in this life area. For domains with very high and high amounts of change the item analysis clearly showed that change was possible for most participants on most items, and that most participants did improve.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>#</strong></th>
<th>Variable/Item</th>
<th>% of Improv.</th>
<th>Number of Offenders</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor to Good</td>
<td>Good to Poor</td>
<td>No Change: Poor</td>
<td>No Change: Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>participation and performance</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>peer interactions</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>authority interactions</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>currently unemployed</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>financial problems</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>reliance on social assistance</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>nonrewarding, other relatives</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>dissatisfaction marital</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>nonrewarding, parental</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>accommodation dissatisfaction</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>high-crime neighbourhood</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>no recent participation in organized activity</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>could make better use of time</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>no anti-criminal friends</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>social isolate</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>some criminal friends</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>medical</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>% Improvement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>other indicators</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>marital and family</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>school and work</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>alcohol problem, currently</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>drug problem, currently</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>law violations</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.625</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>% Improvement</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>.063</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>severe interference</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>psychological assessment indicators</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>% Improvement</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>.000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>poor attitude toward sentence/offence</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>poor attitude toward supervision/treatment</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>unfavourable toward convention</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>supportive of crime</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* # represents the domain number for following dynamic domains:
  Domain 1: Employment and Education
  Domain 2: Financial
  Domain 3: Family and Marital
  Domain 4: Accommodation
  Domain 5: Leisure and Recreation
  Domain 6: Companions
  Domain 7: Alcohol and Drug Problem
  Domain 8: Emotional and Personal
  Domain 9: Attitudes and Orientation

** % improvement is calculated as the % of those who began the program with scores of 'poor' and ended the program with scores of 'good'.
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Rating Indicators

Table 4 (page 61) presents the thirteen rating indicators scored pre- and post-program on the LSI-R for the forty-four offenders rank ordered by size of change. Rating indicator scales ranged from 0-3, with 0 being the worst rating and 3 being the best rating possible, therefore an increased number in the post rating indicates improvement in the given area. The scores of 0-3 were rated based on specific criteria. A rating of ‘0’ describes a very unsatisfactory situation, indicates a clear and strong need for improvement, an area that requires specific intervention, and an item that will be checked. A rating of ‘1’ describes a relatively unsatisfactory situation, but not as dire as a ‘0’ would indicate, an area that needs improvement, the area will be a focus of intervention, and the item will be checked. A rating of ‘2’ describes a situation that is relatively satisfactory but not as ideal as a ‘3’ would indicate, indicates that there is perhaps a little room for improvement, but this will not be a specific focus of intervention, and this item will not be checked. A rating of ‘3’ describes a satisfactory situation, indicates there is very little or no need for improvement, so this area will not be the focus of intervention, and this area will not be checked. Because of the more detailed scoring, these have the potential of further clarifying where and how much actual change occurred.

The thirteen rating indicators were classified into three levels of positive change from pre- to post-testing: high, moderate, and low. The rating indicators were clustered based on natural breaks. Differences between pre- and post-mean scores of 0.93 to 1.14 were classified as ‘high’, scores of 0.25 to 0.54 were classified as ‘moderate’, and scores of 0.11 to 0.12 were classified as ‘low’ levels of change. As seen in Table 4 (page 61), seven rating indicators were classified as presenting ‘high’ levels of change, four rating indicators were
classified as 'moderate', and the two remaining rating indicators were classified as 'low' levels of change from pre- to post-testing.

As seen in Table 4 (page 61), nine changes were statistically significant at a level of .004 or lower (the Bonferroni correction produced p-value of ≤ .004 for a true alpha level of .05). Nonrewarding parental interactions and dissatisfactory marital situation (both from 'family and marital' domain), drug problem and alcohol problem (both from 'drug and alcohol problem' domain), did not show statistically significant changes. The 'drug and alcohol problem' indicators were also very high to begin with, leaving little room for change and showing that most had no problems. All four are not likely to change over a short time period, as discussed earlier in the domain t-test results. Furthermore, except for nonrewarding parental, these results coincide with the results for the domain t-tests and the conclusions that joint programming (substance abuse program along with social skills program) may produce more successful outcomes for the area of drug and alcohol problems. The 'low' level of change classification for the indicator 'dissatisfactory marital situation' also supports the results of 'low' levels of positive pre- to post-score change in the 'family and marital' dynamic domain.

The 'unfavourable towards convention' indicator (M change=1.14) (from 'attitudes and orientation' domain) was found to be the rating indicator that showed the most predominant improvements for the offenders, thus classified as 'high' levels of change. This result supports Counter-Point's targeted goal of altering participant attitudes and orientations from pro-criminal to pro-social, thus becoming more favourable towards conventional attitudes and orientations.
Also in support of shifting pro-criminal attitudes towards pro-social are the indicators that ranked second in improvements from pre- to post-testing: participation and performance (M change=1.09, from ‘education and employment’ domain), and accommodation dissatisfaction (M change=1.09, from ‘accommodation’ domain). Program participants improved their participation and performance concerning conventional activities (e.g. school, work, programs, etcetera). Concerning living conditions, it is important to note that the improvements found for the accommodation dissatisfaction indicator may in part be due to the offenders’ recent relocation from prison to group homes or from group homes to private homes at the time of program entry. The improvement rating in the accommodation indicator may also reveal that the participants in general became more satisfied with their living conditions, therefore made progress to address their areas of concern or dissatisfaction regarding their accommodation from pre- to post-program.

Peer interactions (M change=1.02), and authority interactions (M change=1.00), both from the ‘education and employment’ domain, resulted in ‘high’ levels of improvement from pre- to post-scoring, displaying an increase in the participants’ ability to interact in a positive manner with their peers and authority figures (e.g. at work, at school, in program, etcetera). These results support the conclusions from the domain t-tests for the ‘education and employment’ domain where moderate changes resulted for the overall domain. The rating indicator results support that the participants may have improved their skills in this area during the program, which may indicate future improvement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank Order of Change</th>
<th>*Domain #</th>
<th>Rating Indicators</th>
<th>Pre Mean Score</th>
<th>Post Mean Score</th>
<th>Difference Between Pre and Post Mean Scores</th>
<th>Paired T-Test Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 9</td>
<td>unfavourable towards convention</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 1</td>
<td>participation &amp; performance</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 4</td>
<td>accommodation dissatisfaction</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 1</td>
<td>peer interactions</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1</td>
<td>authority interactions</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 9</td>
<td>supportive of crime</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 2</td>
<td>financial problems</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 5</td>
<td>could make better use of time</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 3</td>
<td>nonrewarding, other relatives</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 3</td>
<td>nonrewarding, parental</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 7</td>
<td>drug problem, currently</td>
<td>32.66</td>
<td>32.91</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 7</td>
<td>alcohol problem, currently</td>
<td>35.11</td>
<td>35.23</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 3</td>
<td>dissatisfactory marital situation</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Domain # represents the following dynamic domains:
Domain 1: Employment and Education
Domain 2: Financial
Domain 3: Family and Marital
Domain 4: Accommodation
Domain 5: Leisure and Recreation
Domain 7: Alcohol and Drug Problem
Domain 9: Attitudes and Orientation
Univariate Analysis of Variance Results

Domain score changes were examined for variations across values of three potentially confounding variables: 1) the specific program session in which the offender participated, 2) the total scores for the pre-tests, and 3) the static domain of the offenders’ criminal history. The purpose of conducting the Anovas, was to determine if these variables had a significant impact on changes in LSI-R dynamic domain scores. If a statistically significant result was found, it would potentially indicate that the success of the Counter-Point program may be influenced by a particular confounding variable, i.e. one external to the program.

As displayed in Table 5 (page 64), only one Anova produced a statistically significant result. The static domain of criminal history significantly influenced change in ‘companion’ scores (F=3.573, df=8, p=.004). These findings indicate that the criminal history of an offender may influence one area of the Counter-Point program’s success. This result may demonstrate that the more severe or extensive the criminal history of the offender, the less success the offender may have in the area of progressive change in companions. This result is not surprising in that the more extensive the criminal history of the offender, the more frequently the offender associated with criminal companions, such as in jail or living with fellow offenders in group homes on a regular basis as well as potentially in conjunction with committing offences. These constant associations would generally result in friendships that would easily produce a solid secondary support group for the offender. Friendship ties that are solidified by time, regular contact, and common circumstances (also involving living space at times) are difficult to remove oneself from, and may take a significant period of time. Therefore, it is expected that the area of ‘companions’ would take a longer period of
time than the two month program length to see visible signs of change. Thus, as expected, the extent of the offenders’ criminal past could be correlated with the extent of positive change found in ‘companions’ and whom the offender associates with on a regular basis, particularly if the offender lives in a group home during the time of the program.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable: Potential Confounders</th>
<th>Dependent Variable: Change in Scores, Pre to Post</th>
<th>Sign. of Univariate Anova Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>program number</td>
<td>education and employment</td>
<td>.574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program number</td>
<td>financial</td>
<td>.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program number</td>
<td>family and marital</td>
<td>.617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program number</td>
<td>accommodation</td>
<td>.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program number</td>
<td>Attitude and orientation</td>
<td>.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program number</td>
<td>leisure and recreation</td>
<td>.266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program number</td>
<td>companions</td>
<td>.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program number</td>
<td>alcohol and drug problem</td>
<td>.561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program number</td>
<td>emotional and personal</td>
<td>.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program number</td>
<td>total pre- to post-test scores</td>
<td>.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total pre scores</td>
<td>education and employment</td>
<td>.828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total pre scores</td>
<td>financial</td>
<td>.971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total pre scores</td>
<td>family and marital</td>
<td>.926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total pre scores</td>
<td>accommodation</td>
<td>.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total pre scores</td>
<td>attitude and orientation</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total pre scores</td>
<td>leisure and recreation</td>
<td>.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total pre scores</td>
<td>companions</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total pre scores</td>
<td>alcohol and drug problem</td>
<td>.522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total pre scores</td>
<td>emotional and personal</td>
<td>.433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>criminal history</td>
<td>education and employment</td>
<td>.266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>criminal history</td>
<td>financial</td>
<td>.891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>criminal history</td>
<td>family and marital</td>
<td>.772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>criminal history</td>
<td>accommodation</td>
<td>.846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>criminal history</td>
<td>attitude and orientation</td>
<td>.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>criminal history</td>
<td>leisure and recreation</td>
<td>.639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>criminal history</td>
<td>companions</td>
<td>.004*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>criminal history</td>
<td>alcohol and drug problem</td>
<td>.847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>criminal history</td>
<td>emotional and personal</td>
<td>.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>criminal history</td>
<td>total pre- to post-test scores</td>
<td>.741</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p-value <.05 after Bonferroni correction.
DISCUSSION

The results suggest overall success for the federal offender rehabilitation program 'Counter-Point' at the John Howard Society of Hamilton-Wentworth. The two hypotheses originally outlined for this program evaluation research were: 1) there will be change toward pro-social attitudes and behaviours in all nine dynamic life domains. 2) five dynamic domains of leisure and recreation, companions, alcohol and drug problem, emotional and personal, and attitudes and orientations, will have greater change than the following four dynamic domains: education and employment, financial, family and marital, and accommodation.

The results indicate support for the hypothesized predictions that there would be statistically significant positive change in all nine dynamic life domains (Hypothesis 1). However, in terms of the level or amount of change expected throughout the duration of the Counter-Point program, the domain results that coincide with the prediction of higher levels of change were the 'attitudes and orientations', and 'leisure and recreation' domains. The results that coincide with the prediction of lesser change were the 'family and marital', and 'education and employment' domains. The 'financial' and 'accommodation' domains were hypothesized to result in low levels of change (due to the length of the program). However, the actual results indicated high levels of change for both domains. In opposition, 'emotional and personal', 'alcohol and drug problems', and 'companions' were hypothesized to result in high levels of change, and the actual results indicated low levels of score changes from pre- to post-testing. Thus, the results for these five domains only partially support hypothesis two in that the expected levels of change were not as predicted.
The domains that resulted in very high to moderate levels of positive change from pre- to post-program LSI-R scores are the life areas where attitude and behaviour changes would be expected to produce positive results based on the programming. The dynamic domains of 'attitudes and orientation', 'financial', 'accommodation', 'leisure and recreation', and 'education and employment' could be perceived as life areas that could be pro-socially altered through cognitive-behavioural programs, without the alliance of specialized programming (e.g. substance abuse programs).

The dynamic domains that resulted in low levels of positive change from pre- to post-program LSI-R scores ('family and marital', 'emotional and personal', and 'alcohol and drug problem' domains) could be recognized as life areas that may require cognitive-behavioural programming in combination with specialized programming (i.e. marital counseling, psychological counseling, and substance abuse counseling). There were no items found to have statistically significant changes in the 'family and marital' domain, thus indicating that additional programming may be beneficial in this area. There was one item that was found statistically significant in the 'emotional and personal' domain. "psychological assessment indicators", which explains that the participants who had psychological areas of need improved throughout the program. There were two items in the 'alcohol and drug problem' domain found to be statistically significant, therefore accounting for most of the change in the domain score: 'marital and family', and 'school and work'. These item results suggest that although there were weak positive results for overall substance abuse changes from pre- to post-program, there was significant improvement in the areas of substance abuse for marital and family relations, and school and work performance. In addition, there was a
large percentage of participants who entered the program free of substance abuse problems. thus rated good at the pre-program LSI-R.

Even though there were low levels of change in the 'alcohol and drug problem', 'emotional and personal', and 'companions' domains, it is promising that there was change in the desired direction. Research from the literature purports that the categories of 'drug and alcohol abuse problem' and 'companions' were found to be the strongest predictors of recidivism, therefore it is important to investigate these areas fully (Dowden & Brown, 1998; Goggin et al., 1998). When discussing the results for the 'alcohol and drug problem', 'emotional and personal' and 'companions' domains, it is necessary to acknowledge and appreciate that there were high numbers of participants who rated good at the program onset in these domains; there was a small proportion of participants who were able to improve in this domain, therefore explaining the low overall change in pre- to post-program domain scores. The small number of participants who were able to change from pre- to post-scoring in this domain (i.e. poor pre-scores) did show improvement in these dynamic life areas.

The results for the last domain, 'companions', where very low levels of positive change were found from pre- to post-testing, may be explained by investigating the three items analyzed that represented the total domain: no anti-criminal friends, a social isolate, and some criminal friends. A large proportion of participants scored 'good' at the pre-test for two of the three items within the 'companions' domain: no anti-criminal friends (93%), and a social isolate (70%). The large percentage of participants with no problems in this dynamic life domain at the start of the program illustrates why there were very low levels of change (i.e. there were very few participants who were able to increase from pre- to post-
testing). Lastly, the third item in this domain, “some criminal friends,” resulted with 89% of the participants scoring “poor” at the pre-test and remaining “poor” at the post-test. This result for this item is not surprising and may be explained by the majority of the participants having been recently released from incarceration upon program start, and many living in group homes at the time of the program. Therefore the participants’ regular companions and friends would be those they associate with on a regular basis, those that they spend a great deal of time with, and those with which they live, who are in similar circumstances with the law as the participants.

The third “companions” item, “some criminal friends,” is an important life area for Counter-Point to strengthen intervention. A person’s environment, primary group (i.e. those with whom one is in a personal relationship), and secondary group (i.e. those with whom one interacts but is not intimately connected) offer significant reinforcements and influences on their behaviour and attitude (Akers. 1973). Therefore, it is essential that Counter-Point address the “companions” life domain in further detail due to the fact that most of the program participants are enveloped in criminal environments (e.g. group homes), criminal primary groups (e.g. criminal family, criminal friends living with them in the group homes), and criminal secondary groups (e.g. former companions, fellow program participants). Due to the crucial influence that reinforcement has on behaviour and attitudes, intervention in the “companions” life domain would substantially increase pro-social participant behaviours and attitudes, thus decreasing potential recidivism.
CONCLUSIONS

Rehabilitation and correctional program evaluation has received much attention in the research and academic world, however it is still in its youth. There is an ongoing need for additional research to be conducted in this field in order to further eliminate debate over the issues of correctional programming and questions about ‘what works’. As previously supported in the literature, the use of the Level of Service Inventory-Revised appears to be one of the most promising measurement instruments in predicting program outcomes. There also appears to be a growing consensus supporting the correlation between dynamic need factors and offender recidivism.

As discussed in the Theory chapter, based on Differential Association-Reinforcement Theory, a successful rehabilitation program (i.e. program that reduces recidivism) must: 1) change beliefs and attitudes to view criminal behaviour as undesirable; 2) instill beliefs and attitudes that support non-criminal behaviours as desirable; 3) remove the individual from the subculture and primary group that is supportive of anti-social norms; 4) integrate the individual into a subculture and primary group that is supportive of pro-social norms; 5) address gaps in skills required for success (and consequent positive reinforcement from) in non-criminal activities of daily living. Prerequisites one, two, and five have direct associations with the ‘attitudes and orientation’ dynamic life domain in which the research results indicate very high levels of success for Counter-Point. Prerequisites three and four are associated with the ‘companions’ domain, where Counter-Point showed success, although to a lesser extent than the ‘attitudes and orientation’ life domain. Therefore, for optimum program results, it is my recommendation for Counter-Point to fully appreciate the
importance of addressing the ‘companions’ domain, as the program fully appreciates and addresses the significance of the ‘attitudes and orientation’ domain.

Cognitive Behavioural-Based Programming

The major debate in the research literature concerning rehabilitation programming has been whether offender programming works, and if so, what kinds of programs have been the most successful to date. As demonstrated in the literature review, programs that target the development of pro-social perceptions, thinking and reasoning skills, and problem solving skills have had the most successful results in improving dynamic life domains. By improving dynamic domains, the chance of recidivism for the offenders is reduced, thus supporting the success of rehabilitation programs of a cognitive-behavioural type. Furthermore, programs that are theoretically based have been shown to be five times more successful than programs without such a base, and cognitive-based programs (i.e. Social Learning Theory) were found to be twice as effective as noncognitive-based programs (Izzo & Ross, 1990).

The Counter-Point program is a cognitive-behavioural based program that targets seven program goals primarily centred around altering program participants’ behaviour and thought processes: 1) enhance client willingness to alter criminal attitudes and behaviours via motivational techniques. 2) provide participants with the skills necessary to identify and challenge pro-criminal attitudes. 3) assist participants to develop and adopt pro-social attitudes. 4) provide participants with the self-regulation and self-management skills to ensure attitudinal and behavioural change. 5) assist participants to identify high-risk situations and develop necessary resources to prevent future criminal behaviour. 6) increase
personal responsibility and accountability by developing empathy and perspective taking
skills, and 7) encourage access into pro-social activities (Counter-Point Program Manual).

The overall results of this research support the success of cognitive-behavioural
based programming. The results indicate that Counter-Point was successful in altering pro-
criminal attitudes and behaviours towards pro-social lifestyles in the nine dynamic life
domains for the program participants: education/employment, financial, family/marital,
accommodation, leisure/recreation, companions, alcohol/drug problem, emotional/personal,
and attitudes/orientation.

Results and Theory

The four domains that resulted in low levels of pre- to post-program change scores
(‘family and marital’, ‘emotional and personal’, ‘alcohol and drug problem’, ‘companions’) need to be investigated theoretically. Differential Association-Reinforcement Theory contends that learning techniques that would permit a person to commit criminal acts, and learning the definitions which motivate a person to commit criminal acts, result in a person being exposed to and adopting belief systems and attitudes that endorse criminal behaviour (Akers. 1978). Once pro-criminal attitudes and beliefs are adopted, criminal behaviour becomes normative. The adoption of pro-criminal attitudes and beliefs result in deviant behaviour being placed in a functional and positive light, or result in definitions which neutralize deviant behaviour as unfavorable, thus opposing pro-social conduct (1978). Upon the onset of the Counter-Point program, the participants have already accepted and adopted pro-criminal attitudes, beliefs, and orientations, thus allowing them to place criminal activity in a positive light or neutralizing their past behaviour. The results of this research support
that Counter-Point was successful in targeting these developed pro-criminal attitudes and beliefs and altering the participants’ orientations towards pro-social attitudes and belief systems.

Furthermore, a person’s environment and primary group is central to a person’s conformity to subcultural norms, beliefs, and attitudes that may support pro-criminal orientations and patterns of conduct. Therefore it is important to be aware of the impact and influence that the primary group and the social environment have on a person’s orientation and behaviour. An individual’s marital and family relations as well as their companions play a crucial role in the development of attitudes and conduct, be it towards pro-social or pro-criminal. In addition, an individual’s emotional and personal stability and their progression into or out of substance abuse are directly influenced by their primary associations (i.e. marriage partners, family, companions) and environments (i.e. living environments, associations, accommodation circumstances). The results of this research indicate success for the Counter-Point program with respect to improving the participants’ pre- to post-domain scores in ‘family and marital’, ‘companions’, ‘emotional and personal’, and ‘alcohol and drug problem’. However it is necessary to recognize the impact that each life domain has on the others, and the association and connection between each life domain (e.g. the impact that family and companions have on emotional stability or substance abuse stability). Once the magnitude of these relationships are recognized and appreciated, the theoretical interplay in the programming may be strengthened by addressing these life domain connections during participant group interaction during sessions applying consequence and alternative solutions to behaviour.
Recommendations

There are several limitations for this study which are thoroughly addressed in the Research Methods chapter: lack of control group, small sample size, one facilitator, and ability to accurately measure dynamic factors (e.g. attitude). These limitations have to be taken into consideration when contemplating the generalizability of this research. Although this is only one program (i.e. Counter-Point) conducted in one city (i.e. Hamilton) with one facilitator (i.e. JHS of Hamilton-Wentworth Counter-Point facilitator), the results were both strong and specific (i.e. attitudes changed a great deal while certain behavioural areas less) suggesting that it does add to the body of literature on rehabilitation programs and particular areas of success. The results also speak highly of what the John Howard Society is able to accomplish. Therefore, the recommendation concluded from this research is that the Counter-Point program should continue to be funded and should be implemented in other John Howard Society offices in other cities.

My recommendations for the John Howard Society of Hamilton-Wentworth are three-fold: 1) further concentration on weaker areas such as companions and associates. 2) combining cognitive behavioural-based programming with targeted needs programming (i.e. substance abuse, marital counseling, psychological counseling), and 3) short-term and long-term evaluation research.

To begin, I believe that it is necessary for the Counter-Point program to more effectively target the ‘companions’ domain. The program participants have either recently been released to their private homes from incarceration or released into group homes, therefore the program must address in further detail how the participants can develop the
skills necessary to expand outside of their immediate environments in order to cultivate friendships and associations of a pro-social nature. As discussed in the results chapter, the low levels of change in the 'companions' domain from pre- to post-testing is explainable due to the participants' circumstances and environments. Therefore if the explanations are appreciated, then the Counter-Point program needs to specifically target this domain in terms of developing the skills and orientations necessary for immediate change for the participants in this life area.

The second recommendation is for the John Howard Society to consider a partnership with outside organizations for combined programming formats. The results indicate that Counter-Point has been successful in its targeted goals, however there are weaknesses in the areas of substance abuse, marital problems, and psychological problems. Therefore, I recommend that combined programming between Counter-Point and specialized programs in the areas of substance abuse, marital counseling and psychological counseling would produce a foundation for success for those participants with special needs (i.e. specific problems) in these mentioned areas. It is important to note, however, that most participants had good scores for the 'alcohol and drug problem' domain at the start of the program, thus few participants needed to (or were able to) improve in this life area, which partially explains the low domain change scores. A high percentage of the participants who were poor in this domain at pre-program did improve, however my recommendation for combined specialized programming could potentially further strengthen the overall improvement in this domain.

The third recommendation is for the John Howard Society to formulate an ongoing evaluation system for the Counter-Point program. Based on the results from this research.
as well as the limitations of this research, I believe that both short-term and long-term evaluation would be beneficial to the program and the participants. The present research produced an overview of the immediate success of the program, along with specific areas of strength and weakness within the program and its goals. Such short-term evaluation combined, potentially, with a qualitative evaluation, such as participant interviewing, would offer ongoing and additional insight into areas of specific strength and weakness and how the participants feel about the program and the areas that they feel assisted them in developing the skills necessary to succeed. Long-term evaluation (e.g. six months and one year post-program) would allow the John Howard Society to investigate where the participants succeeded or failed after program completion. Longitudinal research would also provide evidence to support theory based research on the correlation between dynamic domains and recidivism.
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## Appendix I

**FIGURE 2**

### Program Content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODULE ONE</th>
<th>SETTING THE CONTEXT FOR CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td>Enhancing Motivation for Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td>Cost-Benefit Analysis for Criminal Behaviour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODULE TWO</th>
<th>ATTITUDES THAT SUPPORT CRIMINAL BEHAVIOUR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Session 3</td>
<td>The ABC Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 4</td>
<td>Identifying Thinking the Contributes to Criminal Behaviour, Part I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 5</td>
<td>Techniques of Neutralization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 6</td>
<td>Neutralizations Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 7</td>
<td>Identifying Thinking that Contributes to Criminal Behaviour, Part II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 8</td>
<td>Inventory of Procriminal Beliefs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODULE THREE</th>
<th>ALTERING ANTISOCIAL ATTITUDES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Session 9</td>
<td>Challenging Procriminal Attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 10</td>
<td>Changing Procriminal Attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 11</td>
<td>Developing Prosocial Beliefs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODULE FOUR</th>
<th>PROSOCIAL PROBLEM SOLVING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Session 12</td>
<td>Steps in Problem Solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 13 &amp; 14</td>
<td>Problem Solving Practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODULE FIVE</th>
<th>VICTIM AWARENESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Session 15</td>
<td>Victims’ Experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 16</td>
<td>Acknowledging Victims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 17</td>
<td>Role Plays</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODULE SIX</th>
<th>MAINTAINING CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Session 18</td>
<td>Relapse Prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 19</td>
<td>Action Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 20</td>
<td>Review and Closure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| MODULE 7                 | BOOSTER SESSIONS                         |
Appendix II
JHS NEEDS ASSESSMENT
THE LEVEL OF SERVICE INVENTORY-REVISED (LSI-R)

Client Name: __________________________ JHS ID: ______

Date Assessment Completed: ______________ Worker ID: ______

Circle Appropriate Assessment Interval: Intake 3-Month 6-Month 9-Month
12-Month 16-Month 18-Month 21-Month 24-Month

A 1. Criminal History
- 1. Any prior adult convictions ( )
- 2. Two or more prior convictions
- 3. Three or more prior convictions
- 4. Three or more present offences ( )
- 5. Arrested under age 16
- 6. Ever incarcerated upon conviction
- 7. Escape history from a correctional facility
- 8. Ever punished for institutional misconduct ( )
- 9. Charge laid or probation parole suspended during prior community supervision
- 10. Official record of assault/violence
    = Subtotal

F 6. Leisure/Recreation
- 30. No recent participation in an organized activity
- 31. Could make better use of time ( )
    = Subtotal

Companions
- 32. A social isolate
- 33. Some criminal acquaintances
- 34. Some criminal friends
- 35. No anti-criminal acquaintances
- 36. No anti-criminal friends
    = Subtotal

Alcohol/Drug Problem
- 37. Alcohol problem, ever
- 38. Drug problem, ever
- 39. Alcohol problem, currently ( )
- 40. Drug problem, currently ( )
- 41. Law violations
- 42. Marital/Family
- 43. School/Work
- 44. Medical
- 45. Other indicators: __________________________
    = Subtotal

B 2. Education/Employment
- 11. Currently unemployed
- 12. Frequently unemployed
- 13. Never employed for a full year
- 14. Ever fired
- 15. Less than regular grade 10
- 16. Less than regular grade 12
- 17. Suspended or expelled at least once
- 18. Participation/performance ( )
- 19. Peer interactions ( )
- 20. Authority interactions ( )
    = Subtotal

Emotional/Personal
- 46. Moderate interference
- 47. Severe interference
- 48. Mental health treatment, past
- 49. Mental health treatment, present
- 50. Psychological assessment indicators:
    = Subtotal

C 3. Financial
- 21. Problems ( )
- 22. Reliance upon social assistance
    = Subtotal

D 4. Family/Marital
- 23. Dissatisfactory marital or equivalent situation ( )
- 24. Nonrewarding, parental ( )
- 25. Nonrewarding, other relatives ( )
- 26. Criminal family/spouse
    = Subtotal

Attitudes/Orientation
- 51. Supportive of crime ( )
- 52. Unfavorable toward convention ( )
- 53. Poor, toward sentence/offence
- 54. Poor, toward supervision/treatment
    = Subtotal

E 5. Accommodation
- 27. Dissatisfaction ( )
- 28. Three or more address changes last year ( )
- 29. High-crime neighbourhood
    = Subtotal

Circumstances Requiring Special Attention

__________
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## Program Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELEMENT</th>
<th>CHARACTERISTIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Underlying Theory</td>
<td>Social Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>Cognitive-Behavioural</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Program Goals            | - Enhance client willingness to alter criminal attitudes and behaviours via motivational techniques.  
|                          | - Provide participants with the skills necessary to identify and challenge procriminal attitudes.  
|                          | - Assist participants to develop and adopt prosocial attitudes.  
|                          | - Provide participants with the self-regulation and self-management skills to ensure attitudinal and behavioural change.  
|                          | - Assist participants to identify high-risk situations and develop necessary resources to prevent future criminal behaviour.  
|                          | - Increase personal responsibility and accountability by teaching developing empathy and perspective taking skills.  
|                          | - Encourage access into prosocial activities. |
| Program Design and Evaluation | - Quasi-Experimental (Control Group)  
|                          | - Pre-Post Assessment  
|                          | - Ongoing Process Evaluation (Intermediate Targets)  
|                          | - Recidivism Outcome |
| Program Integrity        | - Experienced Program Designers  
|                          | - Program Manual  
|                          | - Facilitator's Manual  
|                          | - Training Facilitators Manual |
| Program Features         | - Structured  
|                          | - Group Format (Modified for individual use)  
|                          | - Sequential (Some flexibility with program entry)  
|                          | - Interactive (Role plays, rehearsal, video-feedback, group discussion and reflective exercises)  
|                          | - Self-Help Assignments (Homework)  
|                          | - Prosocial Modelling  
|                          | - Intrinsic Rewards  
<p>|                          | - Extrinsic Rewards |
| Program Setting          | - Community-based agency and residential settings |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELEMENT</th>
<th>CHARACTERISTIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Entry and Participation Guidelines</td>
<td>□ Referral Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Screening Procedure (Monitor for risk level, moderate to high; anxiety, high levels inappropriate; intelligence and literacy, grade 6 level of comprehension required; can be used with substance abusers, sex offenders, woman abusers, and controlled psychiatric populations ONLY to supplement specific treatment programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Intake (Consent to participate, attendance requirements, limits to confidentiality)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Reporting Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Problematic and Disruptive Behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Training</td>
<td>□ Knowledge of social learning theory, cognitive-behavioural intervention strategies, and group dynamics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Experience in working with offender clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Ongoing participation in team meetings and clinical supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Adherence to standards of professional conduct</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consent Contract

The Executive Director of the John Howard Society of Hamilton-Wentworth, Duncan Gillespie, authorizes Bonnie McKinnon to access Counter-Point offender file information for the ten programs between April 1997 to September 1999, and to observe sessions of the 1999 summer program, for the purpose of gathering data to evaluate the Counter-Point program. Ms. McKinnon will use these data in preparing a Master of Arts thesis at the University of Windsor. Ms. McKinnon hereby agrees to, and is bound by, all John Howard Society confidentiality standards, specifically: 1) names of the participants will neither leave the John Howard Society premises nor be referred to in the thesis or any articles or reports based on it, and 2) only aggregate data will be reported.

The John Howard Society of Hamilton-Wentworth understands and agrees to the program evaluation being conducted by Ms. McKinnon and offers full cooperation. The purpose of this evaluation of Counter-Point is to investigate the success of the program and to measure the impact that the program has on the participants. The Counter-Point evaluation consists of conducting a Level of Service Inventory-Revised assessment and a quantitative analysis of variance of the variables present in the LSI-R.

Duncan Gillespie and the John Howard Society of Hamilton-Wentworth will receive a copy of the final thesis and analysis and will have the right to this information for their own use within their organization. If Ms. McKinnon wishes to publish or present a draft of the thesis results, the information will first be reviewed by the John Howard Society for approval.

I, Duncan Gillespie, consent to the above agreement for Bonnie McKinnon to evaluate the Counter-Point program and therefore have access to applicable offender files.

Duncan Gillespie  
Executive Director  
John Howard Society of Hamilton-Wentworth

I, Bonnie McKinnon, consent to the above agreement between myself and the John Howard Society of Hamilton-Wentworth and agree to all confidentiality standards set by this organization.

Bonnie L. McKinnon  
Master of Arts  
University of Windsor
ILIATION

J ohn Howard Society of Durham Region

INFORMATION RELEASE FORM

96 Bruce Street
P.O. Box 751
Oshawa, Ontario
L1H 7M1

Date

I hereby authorize and instruct the John Howard Society of Durham Region to release to .................................................................

................................................................. any information contained in my confidential file in the custody of the said Society which in the sole discretion of the said Society is deemed by the said Society to be relevant for the purpose of .................................................................

Signed

Witnessed
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IX CONFIDENTIALITY

Confidentiality is intended to provide an atmosphere where individuals engaged in service with the agency can discuss personal matters without fear of that information being passed on to others beyond the personnel of the John Howard Society of Ontario and its branches.

Where information must be shared with other bodies or individuals, and confidentiality is not assured by these bodies or individuals, the client must be cautioned.

In case situations where doubt exists regarding the matter of confidentiality, the situation should be discussed with the supervisor of the agency.

No agreements with other agencies, whether written or verbal, shall restrict the application of the above policy.

When in working with a client to develop a helpful plan, the disclosure of confidential material becomes necessary, the client's consent to disclosure must be made on the disclosure consent form which forms Appendix 'A' to this document.

All knowledge which the agency has regarding an individual is confidential except when:

1. A danger to the community or the individual exists.
2. Where failure to disclose the information will cause greater harm than the disclosure of the information.
3. Where there is a legal responsibility to disclose information.
4. Permission in writing from the client is received.
5. Where public refutation of statements made by, or on behalf of, a client is required to protect the integrity of the agency.

No more information than necessary will be disclosed when the above exceptions are invoked.
The executive director or his/her clearly defined designate must authorize any of the above enumerated exceptions.

Worker/client information is not privileged under law. Files can be subpoenaed. Workers can be summoned to testify.

Note: The final two paragraphs were added by the Standards and Evaluations Sub-Committee to the Executive Directors Advisory Committee in September 1985.
1. The client's business and all Agency business is to be treated with maximum respect and is not to be discussed with individuals not concerned with such confidential information. Failure to observe the confidentiality of information is considered a violation of Agency policy.

2. Release of confidential information by telephone is to be avoided. In case of emergency, the authorized staff member will obtain the individual's and the organization's name and telephone number and return the call, maintaining a record in the relative file.

3. Information concerning employees will only be released for recognized reference checking. Specific information will be provided only on the employee's authorization.

4. If and when confidential client information is taken off the premises, staff are expected to ensure its security by exercising maximum care and vigilance.
ILLUSTRATION

JOHN HOWARD SOCIETY OF DURHAM REGION

INFORMATION RELEASE FORM

94 Bruce Street
P.O. Box 951
Oshawa, Ontario
L1H 7R1

Date

I hereby authorize and instruct


to release to the John Howard Society of Durham Region, any information that
they may require relevant to the purpose of


Signed

Witnessed
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XII RECORDING AND FILES

1. Purposes:
   a. Recording is essential for the administrative accounting and evaluation of agency activity from which judgements can be made regarding the nature and quantity of services rendered.
   b. Recording is essential to assess the quality and continuity of service.
   c. Recording is essential for the planning and ongoing assessment of the treatment process.

2. Material included:
   a. Statistical worksheets.
   b. Face sheets.
   c. File notes.
   d. Assessments and reports.
   e. Correspondence.

3. Minimum content:
   a. Frequency of contact.
   b. Place of contact.
   c. Nature of problem(s).
   d. Contract agreed to by agency and client.
   e. Action taken and planned.
   f. Outcome.
4. Minimum standard of content:

The agency recognizes that the implications of recording subjective statements and impressions, without supporting data, are potentially misleading and damaging to the client in his future relationships with the agency and others.

Staff must limit the recording of subjective statements to the degree necessary for proper planning and must state factual incidents leading to the subjective statements, as well as clearly labelling the statement as subjective.

5. Opening of files:

A file must be opened on any client where service has been recorded statistically.

6. Destruction of files:

Files on individuals where contact has not been made for SEVEN (7) years normally should be destroyed.

7. Jurisdiction of Recording Standards

These recording standards supersede any and all standards and expectations of other agencies or groups whether under contract with the agency or not.

8. Client access to files.

The client may have access to his file if staff are present to interpret its contents except where disclosure may hurt the client or someone else or where information from another source is already understood to be confidential a) by law, b) by agreement between agency and body contracting for service, e.g., NPS, c) by specific request of the third party.

If at all possible, accepting confidential information which cannot be shared with the client should be avoided. In any case, every effort should be made to protect such confidences,
but situations may arise where the disclosure is beyond the agency's control.

* This revised wording was recommended by the Standards and Evaluations Sub-Committee to the Executive Directors Advisory Committee in September 1985.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME:</th>
<th>Bonnie L. McKinnon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLACE OF BIRTH:</td>
<td>St. Thomas, Ontario, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR OF BIRTH:</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| EDUCATION:  | Strathroy District Collegiate Institute  
             | Strathroy, Ontario  
             | 1989-1994 OSSID |
|            | McMaster University  
             | Hamilton, Ontario  
             | 1994-1998 B.A. |
|            | University of Windsor  
             | Windsor, Ontario  
             | 1998-2001 M.A. |