

THE GUELPH ABATTOIR PROGRAMME:  
AN INNOVATIVE APPROACH TO CORRECTIONAL INDUSTRIES  
II. INMATE RESPONSE

By

M. J. IRVINE

59/84



Ontario

MINISTRY OF  
CORRECTIONAL  
SERVICES

Honourable Frank Drea  
Minister  
Glenn R. Thompson  
Deputy Minister

**MINISTRY OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES**

**PROVINCE OF ONTARIO**



**PLANNING AND SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION**

**M. J. Algar**  
**Assistant Deputy Minister**

**PLANNING AND RESEARCH BRANCH**

**James J. Hug, Ph.D.**  
**Director**

**A.C. Birkenmayer**  
**Chief, Research Services**

**March 1978**

NCJRS

JUL 11 1979

ACQUISITIONS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The present study would have been impossible to conduct without the splendid cooperation of the inmates, at the Guelph Correctional Center, who volunteered to participate. In addition, the assistance provided by all staff, administrative, clerical and correctional, was duly noted and appreciated. A special note of gratitude is extended to Mr. S. Keane, then Superintendent, Mr. K. Grottenthaler, Senior Assistant Superintendent (Services and Industries), Mr. J. Carey, Temporary Absence Programme Supervisor and all the Correctional Officers on the T.A.P. unit, for their cooperation, assistance and encouragement.

The author would like to thank several research colleagues for their assistance and encouragement. In particular, appreciation is extended to Mr. P. Madden, Research Data Analyst, for his assistance in both the interviewing and data processing and to Mrs. N. Mulvihill, Research Assistant, for her assistance in interviewing. Mr. R. E. Smith, Research Associate and Dr. A. C. Birkenmayer, Chief, Research Services, both provided meaningful and constructive guidance throughout my involvement in this project. Special acknowledgement is due to Mr. R. Shortt, the initial principal investigator.

## OVERVIEW

The present report is the second to emerge from a comprehensive evaluation of the Guelph Abattoir Programme. An earlier report detailed the Correctional Officers' responses to the programme. The present report compares the attitudes toward both the programme and work in general of the inmates involved in the programme with those of inmates not involved.

The results indicated that all inmates generally hold positive attitudes concerning work. The data did not support traditional assumptions that inmates possess attitudes that are incompatible with successful work performance. In terms of post-release employment potential, the real needs of the inmates were shown to be in the areas of useable skills, training and the ability to conduct job searches.

Characteristics distinguishing the inmates involved in the programme from those in the comparison sample reveal that the selection procedure isolates the "model prisoners". These inmates exhibited the greatest stability both prior to and during incarceration and perhaps least needed the intervention of the programme.

The inmates in both the employed and non-employed groups generally agreed that the Abattoir Programme would likely have a beneficial impact on both the inmates involved and the institution. These predictions were born out by the observations of the employed inmates at the conclusion of their involvement. The employed inmates, including those who were terminated prior to release, consistently reported satisfaction with the experience and generally indicated improvements in their attitudes regarding work, post-release employment potential and the impact of incarceration.

Slightly more than half of the inmates admitted into the programme were terminated prior to their release from the institution. One third voluntarily withdrew and more than half of the terminated inmates were removed for institutional violations. Almost all of the terminated inmates supported the programme in principle and most were willing, with some modifications, to return to the abattoir.

The programme, on the whole, was not seen to have created many problems. The most common criticisms were that inmates were not given the same treatment as civilians and that there was some friction between the inmates in the programme and the other regular inmates in the institution.

The majority of the employed inmates reported having positive and constructive plans for the use of their savings. Most of the married inmates had continued to provide financial support for their families and, as a result, generally reported a beneficial impact. The data indicates a possible need in the future for ensuring proper use of the money by the spouses.

There was no reliable change in self-esteem for the inmates in either group during incarceration. Self-esteem measures, taken immediately prior to release, were found to be reliably related to the availability of post-release employment but unrelated to successful programme involvement.

Behaviour misconduct charges, the intended criterion measure of institutional conduct, was judged by the researchers to lack adequate validity, especially for the employed group of inmates. As a result, complete information on the impact of the programme, on institutional behaviour, was unavailable.

The programme is discussed in terms of its evaluability at the present time. It is determined that it fails to satisfy some critical preconditions for proper programme definition. In particular, it was continually changing and failed to provide clear specifications of goals, success criteria and a theoretical basis for assuming achievement. Thus, it was concluded that the Abattoir Programme was not a formal programme, suitable for outcome evaluation.

Despite this, and in conclusion, the programme was judged by the inmates to be a highly desirable alternative to and reduces the impact of conventional incarceration. If attitudes are a sole indicator, a likely beneficial impact on a number of dimensions was predicted.

The suggestions for future programme development include:

- 1) Provide realistic, useful training
- 2) Clearly specify the target goals
- 3) Select the most appropriate inmates
- 4) Maximize communication
- 5) Avoid temporary absence from the institution
- 6) Investigate the optimum numbers of inmates to be involved
- 7) Establish permanent housing facilities prior to the implementation of the programme
- 8) Ensure that the inmates are not treated differently from the civilians
- 9) Ensure continued family support
- 10) Provide adequate meals for the employed inmates
- 11) Assist post-release employment searches

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Acknowledgement .....	i
Overview .....	ii
List of Tables .....	v
I. Introduction .....	1
II. Description of the Abattoir Programme .....	3
III. Methodology .....	5
A. Focus .....	5
B. Procedure .....	5
C. Samples .....	6
i. Employed Sample .....	6
ii. Non-employed Sample .....	7
IV. Results .....	8
A. Demographic Characteristics of the Sample Groups	8
B. Criminal History .....	10
C. General Work Attitudes .....	12
D. Abattoir Programme Evaluation - first interview predictions .....	12
E. Abattoir Programme Evaluation - second interview predictions .....	14
F. Self-esteem .....	17
G. Institutional Behaviour .....	17
H. Termination Interviews .....	18
I. Predicted and Observed Problems .....	19
V. Discussion .....	23
VI. Problems and Suggestions .....	26
VII. Evaluability of the Abattoir Programme .....	29
References .....	33
Appendix A - Work Attitudes .....	34

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Employed Sample: Subgroup sizes .....	6
2	Non-employed Sample: Subgroup sizes .....	7
3	Reasons for Loss of the Most Recent Employment ...	8
4	Factors Hampering Successful Job Search .....	9
5	Past Reasons for Refusing Employment .....	10
6	Past and Present Criminal History: Average Offence Category Convictions .....	11
7	Between Sample Differences in Criminal History ...	11
8	Predictions of the Impact of the Abattoir Programme: first interview .....	13
9	Likely Future Impact of Private Industry Within Corrections: second interview .....	14
10	Post-release Employment Plans .....	15
11	Plans for Use of Savings .....	16
12	Average Self-esteem Scores .....	17
13	Terminated Inmates: Reasons for Removal from the Programme .....	19
14	Increased Friction between C.O. Staff and Inmates: predictions and observations .....	19
15	Incarceration Made More Difficult: predictions and observations .....	20
16	The Company Will Have Difficulty Training Inmates: predictions and observations .....	20
17	Inmates Will be Treated Differently from Civilians: predictions and observations .....	21
18	Conflicts Between Inmates and Civilians: predictions and observations .....	21
19	Tension Between Employed Inmates and Regular Inmates: predictions and observations .....	22

## I INTRODUCTION

In an endeavour to provide a more realistic work environment for Correctional Centre inmates, the Ontario Ministry of Correctional Services instituted the Outside Managed Industrial Programmes (O.M.I.P.) in June 1975. Briefly, this concept involves the operation of correctional industrial facilities by a private company. In return, pre-selected inmates are hired and trained as regular company employees and receive regular wages. The Abattoir Programme at the Guelph Correctional Centre is the first O.M.I.P. in operation within the Ministry.

The present report is the second of a series stemming from a comprehensive evaluation, of the Abattoir Programme, conducted by the Ministry's Planning and Research Branch. This report focuses on inmate attitudes, during incarceration, toward both the programme and work in general. Comparisons between the inmates employed in the programme and a representative sample of the general inmate population in that institution are made. The first report (Irvine, 1977) detailed the correctional officers' responses to the programme. The next, third and final report will provide information vis à vis the inmates' post-release successes on a number of dimensions, including recidivism.

The need for an evaluation of the inmate response to the programme is obvious. Inmate attitudes could suffice as outcome measures of the programme. However, they are also useful to describe some of the processes entailed in the programme and highlight those warranting scrutiny in future O.M.I.P. development and implementation.

Jeffery and Woolpert (1974) note that correctional jurisdictions have generally failed to provide systematic evaluations of programmes. This, they claim, has resulted in a paucity of information regarding the applicability of certain programmes for certain individuals. They criticize past research efforts for an inadequate use of control or comparison samples. In addition, rehabilitation programmes tend to have vaguely defined selection criteria and tend to select those inmates considered the "most likely to succeed", excluding those who present the most risk. Rudoff and Esselstyn (1973) provide data to support this contention. Their inmate work furlough sample was found to have more education, more favourable work history, more dependents and a greater freedom from addictions. In addition, these inmates reported a more positive self-image as 'non-criminals' than a comparison group of inmates not involved in the furlough programme.

Despite these general research difficulties, successes have been reported with innovative industrial programmes, most notably in Ontario with Temporary Absence schemes (Hug 1971, Crispino 1974). Other work release programmes have reported substantial ancillary benefits beyond the primary goals of the programme. Specifically affected are institutional expenses, family support, recidivism and inmate institutional conduct (Singer 1973, Jeffery and Woolpert 1974, Rudoff and Esselstyn 1973).

Rudoff and Esselstyn (1973) also report improvements in self-image by furlough inmates. This is consistent recent correctional research on self-esteem. For the purposes of comparing the present programme with other similar attempts and in order to assess the impact of this programme on self-esteem, it was decided to include an index of self-esteem in the interviews with the inmates. Bennett, Sorenson and Forshay (1971) have developed and validated a Self Esteem Inventory (S.E.I.) suitable for use with inmates. Satisfactory reliability and validity data on this scale have been reported. The suitability of the S.E.I. for Ontario corrections has been established by Gendreau, Gibson Surridge and Hug (1973) and by Gendreau, Grant and Leipziger (1978). Although Bennett (1974) does not report systematic change in self-esteem during incarceration, he has shown that pre-release self-esteem is positively correlated with successful parole adjustment. Consistent with these findings, it is anticipated that successful rehabilitation involvement would enhance self-esteem and facilitate post-release adjustment.

## II DESCRIPTION OF THE ABATTOIR PROGRAMME

The Guelph Abattoir Programme was first implemented in June 1975 and initially involved both the abattoir and cannery facilities at the Guelph Correctional Centre\*. The programme primarily seeks to provide a real work environment to an optimum number of inmates. In particular, it is aimed at the development of good work habits and improved skills in obtaining and maintaining employment. Through the provision of suitable remuneration, the programme also seeks to provide accumulated savings to ease community re-entry, help support families and defray institutional expenses. Furthermore, useful, on the job training in various meat-packing skills is provided.

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

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

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

The starting wage is \$3.15 per hour and opportunity for increases is available. Violations of a temporary leave of absence, institutional misconduct and poor work performance all constitute grounds for removal from the programme. Inmates are permitted to voluntarily withdraw from the programme and generally cease their employment upon completion of their sentences. A few, with Ministry approval, have continued as civilian employees upon release. Understandably, continued employment at the abattoir is not encouraged. Extensive continued employment would greatly limit the availability of positions for incoming inmates. Furthermore, the potential for problems is created by having ex-inmates working alongside current inmates.

---

\* The present company is the second to be involved in the programme. In November 1975, the original company went into receivership thus forcing a complete suspension of the programme for approximately 2 months. The failure of the company was not due in any way to involvement in the Abattoir Programme. The present company has chosen to operate the abattoir only, hence the complete shutdown of the cannery facility.

In late August, 1977, the Canadian Food and Allied Workers (AFL-C10) assumed responsibility for negotiations on behalf of all of the abattoir employees, including the inmates.\* While the implications of union representation would be of great interest, the present findings are based on data collected prior to the involvement of the union.

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

Even though the work may be located within the institution, all inmates in Outside Managed Industrial Programmes must first be accepted for Temporary Absence. In the Guelph Abattoir Programme, the industry is located outside the security of the main institution. Thus, the inmates in this programme are literally on temporary absence and the programme vastly increases administrative work in the reception area of the institution.

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

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

---

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

### III METHODOLOGY

#### A. Focus

This report seeks to provide a clear outline of the differences between the inmates employed in the Abattoir Programme and a comparison sample drawn from the general inmate population in the institution. The aim is to provide information regarding criminal history, both past and present; personal demographic characteristics, including work history; and institutional behaviour during incarceration. The intention also is to provide comparative data on attitudes concerning the programme, taken at both the onset and conclusion of employment, as well as feelings about work in general, changes in self-esteem, length of involvement in the programme and major reasons behind terminated cases.

#### B. Procedure

Inmates in the employed sample were asked to co-operate with the research after they were accepted into the programme. Inmates in the non-employed sample were selected at random from the inmate population. Attempts were made to equalize the rate of accumulation of subjects in the two samples.

Each participant was first given a semi-structured interview designed to obtain information regarding demographic characteristics, work history, work attitudes in general, attitudes concerning the Abattoir Programme and self-esteem (Bennett Self Esteem Inventory). During the initial interview, the inmates were given a brief description of the programme, regardless of the extent of their knowledge of the programme. Present and past criminal history data, as well as institutional behaviour data, were gathered from the individual inmate files. Approximately six weeks prior to the expiry of their sentences (or release on parole), each available and co-operative inmate was given a second interview. Similar to the first, this interview sought subsequent attitudes toward the programme, including perceived problems, attitudes toward work in general and self-esteem. Some of the employed inmates either withdrew or were fired from the Abattoir Programme prior to their release from the institution. Because attitudes regarding the Abattoir Programme were considered to be a primary concern in the research, these inmates received the second interview plus a termination interview immediately following their removal from the programme.\*

---

\* Research plans initially included a measure of the inmates work performance. Work performance measures of the non-employed inmates had to be dropped because the institution changed its recording scheme midway through the data collection. The new system could not be equated with the old. For the employed inmates, a system of collecting work performance ratings was recommended to but not implemented by either of the two private companies. Thus work performance measures are, regrettably, unavailable and inferences about work performance must be drawn from the attitudes expressed by the inmates.

C. Samples

The accumulation of both sample inmate groups commenced in June 1975, and was terminated in September 1976. Thus, no inmates accepted into the Abattoir Programme after September 30, 1976, are included in this research. The final post-test interview (dependent on the length of sentence) was completed in October 1977.

i. Employed Sample

Information regarding the numbers of employed inmates involved in the various sample sub-groups is provided in TABLE 1. Of the 200 inmates hired during the sample selection period, 78 (39%) were employed for less than three months and were thus deleted from the study. The decision to do this was based on the supposition that involvement for at least three months would be required in order for any impact to occur. It should be noted that there are two groups of terminated inmates in this study; those employed for less than three months (deleted) and those terminated after having been employed for more than three months (kept in the sample). One hundred and twenty-two inmates worked from 90 to 330 days (average 164.21 days). Of these, 104 (85.2%) were available for the first interview and 68 (55.7%) for the second. Eighteen inmates refused to participate. For these inmates only criminal history data are available. Of the inmates who worked for at least three months, 49 (40.2%) were terminated (quit, fired) and 73 (59.8%) were involved in the programme up to the time of their release from the institution. These latter inmates might be described as having been the more "successful" inmates during incarceration.

---

TABLE I: Employed Sample - Subgroup sizes	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Total original intake	200	
Number worked less than 3 months (deleted)	78	39
Total remaining in sample	122	61
Number with no interview (Criminal history information only)	18	14.75
Number with first interview	104	85.25
Number with second interview	68	55.7
Number terminated after 3 months	49	40.2
Number worked to release	73	59.8

---

ii. Non-employed Sample

Information regarding the numbers of non-employed inmates involved in the various sample sub-groups is provided in TABLE 2. Over the sample selection period, 240 randomly selected inmates were placed in the non-employed sample. Sixty-two of these inmates eventually served at least two months of their sentences in a treatment facility or another institution. These transferred inmates were deleted from the study because it was felt that their extra-institutional experiences would bias attempts to provide adequate comparisons with the employed sample. Thirty-one of the non-employed sample eventually entered the employed group. Of the remaining 147 inmates in the non-employed sample, 13 (8.7%) were unavailable for any of the interviews (criminal history data only), 134 (91.1%) received the first interview and 93 (63.3%) received the second interview.

---

TABLE 2: Non-employed Sample - Subgroup sizes

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Total original intake	240	
Number transferred prior to release	62	25.8
Number entering employed sample	31	12.9
Total remaining in sample	147	61.3
Number with no interview (Criminal history information only)	13	8.8
Number with first interview	134	91.2
Number with second interview	93	63.3
Number unsuccessfully applying to the programme	60	25.0

---

IV RESULTS

A. Demographic Characteristics of the Sample Groups

For the majority of demographic variables considered, there were essentially no differences between the inmates in the two groups. On a few important factors, however, there were some statistically reliable differences. The employed inmates tended to be older (average 25.79 years versus 23.59 years,  $t = 2.59$ ,  $p < .01^*$ ). A greater proportion of employed inmates were married with dependents (48% versus 32%,  $t = 2.40$ ,  $p < .05$ ). The employed group had also been in the work force for a longer period of time (average 9.73 years versus 6.78 years,  $t = 3.42$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and had experienced longer periods of uninterrupted employment (average 22.36 months versus 16.57 months,  $t = 2.55$ ,  $p < .05$ ). Furthermore, immediately prior to the present incarceration, more employed inmates were working ( $t = 3.25$ ,  $p < .01$ ). There were no real differences between the two groups in terms of educational achievement (average grade 9.5).

In terms of other work history variables, there were no statistically reliable differences between the two inmate samples. Work history information, therefore, is given on the total inmate sample (N = 238) in order to provide a global perspective of the typical work experiences of inmates. Concise information on isolated categories is provided in TABLES 3, 4 and 5.

---

TABLE 3: Reasons for loss of last job (N = 238)

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Present incarceration	107	45
Voluntarily quit	71	30
Laid off	41	17
Fired	19	8

---

Only 17% of the inmates were accredited tradesmen and 50% reported having no real specialized skills (general labour only). The inmates generally reported a high turnover in employment, with an average of 2.25 jobs held through an average length of only 9.13 months in the previous two years. A majority (60%)

---

\* A  $t$  test is a measure of the standardized difference between the means of two groups in terms of the dispersion within each group. The  $p$  or probability level is an indication of the statistical reliability or degree of confidence one can have in the results. Thus a  $p < .05$  indicated that 5 times out of 100 a statistic will achieve that value by chance and chance alone. Generally speaking, if a difference has a chance of occurring less than 5 times out of 100, the observed difference is judged as being a real difference. The notation NS is used to indicate a statistically non-reliable result, or, in this case,  $p > .05$ .

did not consider their last job as a career, however, 83% indicated that they wanted a working career. It is of interest that only 8% of the inmates were fired from their previous employment and that almost half were forced to leave their job as a result of the present incarceration. Presumably, therefore, these inmates were experiencing stable employment.

Almost all (92%) of the inmates would prefer to work full-time. Only 4% would prefer unemployment. Fifty-eight per cent rated themselves as conscientious workers. As indicated in TABLE 4, a number of inmates reported problems hampering their success in getting employment in the past.\* Although in most categories only a minority of inmates reported difficulty, the results indicate a number of serious issues related to the non-employability of ex-offenders. Specifically, it can be noted that a criminal record, as well as a lack of education, training and experience typically intervene in post-release employment potential. Perhaps more noteworthy is the substantial number, albeit a minority, who report difficulty in some of the more basic skills required to conduct a successful job search (indecisiveness, not knowing where to look).

---

TABLE 4: Factors Hampering Successful Job Search (N = 238)

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Personal Experience (i.e., criminal record)	136	57
Lack of specific skills	121	51
Insufficient working experience	114	48
Lack of education	109	46
Lack of professional or trade recognition of qualifications	102	43
Inability to find a suitable job	86	36
Indecisiveness over type of work to select	86	36
Shortage of jobs in chosen field	52	22
Don't know where to look for a job	43	18

---

---

\* The reader is reminded that all inmates in the present study are recidivists.

Despite the fact that many reported difficulties obtaining employment, a substantial number of inmates have refused jobs in the past. As indicated in TABLE 5, 46% reported having refused a job because of insufficient pay, 38% because they did not like the type of work, 27% because of working conditions and 11% because of the location of the job.

---

TABLE 5: Past Reasons for Refusing Employment (N = 238)

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Insufficient pay	109	46
Did not like type of work	90	38
Did not like working conditions	64	27
Did not like job location	26	11

---

The top four job preferences for all inmates were; self-employment, physical work, maintenance and work out of the city. Factory work, similar to that in the Abattoir Programme, was considered "not at all attractive" by 52% of the inmate and ranked 9th out of 13 choices. There were no differences between the employed and non-employed inmates in this regard. Seventy-two per cent of the inmates stated that they would not work for less than \$3.00 per hour and 94% indicated that they expect to earn more than \$3.00 per hour when released.

#### B. Criminal History

From a statistical standpoint, there were no significant differences between the two sample groups ( $p > .05$ ) in terms of the average number of convictions per inmate for various categories of offences. The absence of differences was evident not only in the convictions leading to the present incarceration but also in past convictions. As the data indicate (TABLE 6), Property Offences (theft, break and enter, fraud etc.) were by far the most common for the inmates in this study. Crimes against the Public Order (Breach of probation, failure to obey court, etc.) were a distant second. In the past, convictions for violence against persons were more frequent than highway traffic offences, but in all other cases, the relative frequencies for the various offence categories were the same for both time periods.

In some respects, the criminal history of the employed inmates was different from that of the comparison group. As indicated in TABLE 7, the employed inmates had been incarcerated more frequently in the past and had more separate previous conviction dates. Expectedly, therefore, these inmates also had been previously sentenced to more months, and, taking early release and earned remission into account, had been incarcerated for more months in the past. They were also serving longer sentences in the present incarceration.

TABLE 6: Past and Present Criminal History: Average Offence Category Convictions (N = 269)

<u>OFFENCE CATEGORY</u>	<u>PRESENT CONVICTIONS AVERAGE PER INMATE</u>	<u>PAST CONVICTIONS AVERAGE PER INMATE</u>
Property Offences	2.01	4.97
Public Order	0.74	1.82
Highway Traffic Offences	0.29	0.27
Violence against Persons	0.17	0.36
Liquor Offences	0.10	0.22
Morals and Decency	0.10	0.14
Total average per inmate	3.41	7.78

TABLE 7: Between - Sample Differences in Criminal History

	Average per inmate		
	<u>Employed (N=122)</u>	<u>Non-employed (N=147)</u>	
Number of previous incarcerations	3.22	2.33	$\underline{t}=2.95, p<.01$
Number of previous conviction dates	5.02	3.78	$\underline{t}=3.61, p<.001$
Number of months sentenced previously	31.72	21.70	$\underline{t}=2.51, p<.05$
Number of months served previously	19.94	13.52	$\underline{t}=2.63, p<.01$
Number of months currently sentenced	24.61	20.97	$\underline{t}=3.33, p<.001$

Thus, there were some differences in the criminal backgrounds of the inmates in the two samples. The differences may reflect the fact that the employed inmates were significantly older, but it could be argued that the younger comparison group, who exhibited the same number of offences had a more concentrated criminal background. However, as the data indicate, the older, employed inmates, despite the age differences, were free from incarceration for roughly the same number of years. Age differences are closely compensated for by the longer periods of incarceration. Thus, the employed inmates likely committed the same number of offences during approximately an equal time span of

liberty. The more severe sentences received by the employed inmates from the courts, infers qualitatively more serious crimes. In other words, while the actual numbers of types of offenses were the same, the extent of perceived damage or seriousness of the crimes may not have been constant.

### C. General Work Attitudes

A non-standardized\* series of questions, focussing on general attitudes concerning wages, unemployment, ambition, selectivity and ambivalence toward work was given to all inmates during both interviews. Only a very few of the possible comparisons were found to be statistically significant (at the  $p < .05$  level). Indeed, approximately 5% of all of the possible comparisons showed real differences. By the criteria set and accepted by this research, this is the number that would be reasonably expected to occur by chance. Consequently, during both interviews, there were essentially no differences in work attitudes between the two inmate samples and there were no changes in attitude concerning work, in general, for either sample.

The specific general work attitude questions are provided in Appendix A, together with the percentage of endorsement for the total inmate sample (averaged over the two interview sessions). For 11 of the 36 questions, positive and supportive responses were given by over 80% of the inmates. If attitude change is a crucial goal of the programme, the likelihood of demonstrated improvement is limited when the inmates already hold attitudes that are acceptable. The other attitudes listed on Appendix A, although endorsed by fewer of the inmates, cannot be considered to be negative. Indeed, none of the inmate attitudes can be considered to be different from a 'normal' civilian population, nor incompatible with adequate work performance. Some of the more predominant attitudes included a dislike of unemployment insurance, satisfaction in completing a good day's work, a general willingness to work at most jobs, but within reason, and a need for non-monetary rewards and satisfaction.

### D. Abattoir Programme Evaluation - first interview predictions

Prior to the first interview, 66% of the total inmate sample claimed that they either knew nothing or very little about the programme. This includes 64 employed sample inmates who, at the time of the interview, had applied and been accepted into the programme. Of the total sample, 28% were "familiar" and only 7% "well informed" about the programme. These findings can easily be misinterpreted however. As will be shown by the data, inmates appear to rely on the impressions and attitudes of others already exposed to the programme. Rather than knowing "very little" or "nothing", about the programme, it will be shown that inmates were generally very familiar with the programme and in fact had few misconceptions. Reports by the majority that they were unfamiliar with the programme likely reflect a feeling that they lacked complete information about the programme.

---

\* Thus, no real comparisons with regular 'normal' population attitudes are possible.

Following a brief but detailed description of the programme, the inmates were asked for their predictions of the impact of the programme. As the data in TABLE 8 indicate, the predictions\* of the two inmate samples were very similar. In only one respect was there a statistically significant difference. A greater proportion of employed inmates predicted reductions in behaviour disruption. It is particularly noticeable that a large majority of the inmates in both samples viewed the target goals of the programme as realistic. A positive, rehabilitative impact on individual inmates was predicted (family and self responsibility, skills). Relatively fewer inmates predicted a positive impact on the lesser goals involving groups of individuals and the institution.

TABLE 8: Predictions of the Impact of the Abattoir Programme: first interview.

<u>Impact</u>	<u>% likely Employed (N=104)</u>	<u>% likely Non-employed (N=134)</u>	
Encourage family responsibility	98	93	NS
Will learn a marketable skill	85	92	NS
Encourage self responsibility	85	91	NS
Encourage good work attitudes	85	84	NS
More community involvement in corrections	85	84	NS
Reduce disruptive behaviour in jail	81	64	p < .05
Breakdown staff/inmate barriers	63	60	NS

Fifty-four per cent of the total inmate sample agreed with the selection of the abattoir as the most appropriate industry for conversion to the O.M.I.P. scheme. Nineteen per cent were ambivalent and 27% felt that some other industry would have been more appropriate. There were no differences between the two groups in this regard. Some inmates felt that there is a scarcity of meat packing jobs in the community and criticized the "dirty work" involved in the meat industry. Ninety-two per cent of the non-employed inmates indicated that they would be interested in applying if a similar programme, but in a different

\* During the first interview, the inmates were asked to predict the likely impact of the Abattoir programme, hence, reference to predictions. During the second interview, they were asked to predict the likely impact of similar future programmes, based on experience with the present programme. These second observations can be interpreted as verification of earlier predictions.

industry, were available. The order of preference for future O.M.I.P. development was; apprenticeship oriented programmes, manufacturing, construction, as well as service and maintenance industries.

E. Abattoir Programme Evaluation - second interview predictions

The 68 employed sample and 93 non-employed sample inmates, available for the second interview, offered their predictions of the impact of future private industrial involvement within corrections. The results, listed in TABLE 9, indicate that the majority of inmates in both samples view the O.M.I.P. concept as having the potential for a favourable impact on a number of dimensions.

TABLE 9: Likely Future Impact of Private Industry Within Corrections: second interview

<u>Impact</u>	<u>% likely Employed (N=68)</u>	<u>% likely Non-employed (N=93)</u>	
Help finance institutions and reduce public expense	98	82	NS
Inmates will contribute to family support	96	98	NS
Improved work habits and attitudes	95	90	NS
Better post-release job opportunities	93	93	NS
Improved inmate management	90	75	p < .05
Better job training than presently available	86	92	NS
Companies will become interested in the goals of corrections	63	63	NS
More tension among inmates at different pay levels	15	25	NS
More behaviour problems	8	15	NS

The favourable attitude was evidenced not only by those inmates who had had extensive involvement with an O.M.I.P. project, but also by those who had received only an indirect exposure to the Abattoir Programme. The results indicate that the least predicted impacts were undesirable outcomes (more tension and behaviour problems). Comparisons of predicted outcomes for the Abattoir Programme (TABLE 8), and later similar predictions for

future O.M.I.P. projects, reveal that in general, there were no changes in inmates' attitudes following either extensive or indirect exposure to the Abattoir Programme.

It is interesting to note that significantly more employed inmates predicted continued improvements in inmate management. In total, this impact was judged to be likely by a large majority of the inmates polled. It is also encouraging that these predictions concur with the officers' observations (Irvine 1977) that there were improvements in inmate behaviour as a result of the Abattoir Programme.

Fifty per cent of the employed sample (N = 34) felt more inclined to seek post-release employment as a direct result of involvement in the Abattoir Programme. An equal number stated that the programme would improve not only their ability to obtain employment, but also their ability to maintain employment. In contrast, the 93 non-employed inmates were less optimistic about the post-release impact of their regular institutional industry experience. Only 32% indicated that they would be more likely to seek employment as a direct result of their institutional industrial experience, and only 21% felt that their institutional experiences would be helpful. Thirty-seven per cent claimed that their work involvement would aid their ability to maintain a job in the future. Only a small minority (5%) reported that the regular Ministry Managed Industrial Programmes would have a deleterious effect on their post-release employment opportunities. The majority, therefore, reported no change in their potential.

Although the inmates' motivation to seek employment may have been differentially affected by their industry experiences, there were no differences between the two samples in terms of post-release employment plans. It is strikingly evident from the data in TABLE 10, that almost all of the inmates plan to seek employment. In addition, it is apparent that a substantial number of inmates, particularly in the employed sample, had made arrangements for some employment.

---

TABLE 10: Post-release Employment Plans

	Employed % (N = 68)	Non-employed % (N = 93)	
Plan to seek work	94	86	NS
Would take any job	29	27	NS
Plan to use previous skills and experience	50	49	NS
Plan to use skills acquired in institution	21	16	NS
Have a job arranged for release	49	37	NS

---

It is interesting to note that 21% (N = 14) of the employed inmates plan to use the experience gained at the Abattoir. Indeed 39% (N = 27) reported that they were interested in continuing abattoir related work. This indicates that at least for many of the inmates, the "dirty" nature of the meat industry was not found to be as negative an experience as had been initially predicted.

Forty-six per cent of the employed inmates reported that their attitudes toward work had improved. Specifically, these inmates claimed that they discovered that they did not mind working (N = 14) and that they actually can work and want to continue working (N = 16).

Sixty-five per cent of the employed sample claimed that as a result of the programme, they were able to make more decisions for themselves. The majority referred to being better able to make realistic post-release plans because of accumulated earnings. As indicated in TABLE 11, the majority of the inmates had positive and constructive plans for the use of the money saved while in the programme. Sixty per cent of married inmates (N = 18) reported having sent money home to their families. Eleven of these inmates reported improved relations as a result of the support. One even reported using the earnings toward the purchase of a home. Three inmates, however, complained that the money sent home was not used properly, which, in one case, resulted in marital separation.

Despite the relatively small number involved, this raises a critical issue which has not been previously considered. Specifically, it identifies a need for further coordination of continued inmate support of families, to ensure that the recipients of the support use the money properly. It is likely that in many cases, the inmates' spouses are equally negligent in financial responsibility. If the inmates are forced to forward a portion of their earnings, counselling of spouses and administrative safeguards are needed to avoid misuse of the support.

---

TABLE 11: Plans for Use of Savings (N = 64)

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Specific purchases	19	30
Self support on release	17	27
Savings account	11	17
Pay debts	9	14
Have already spent/blow it	8	12

---

F. Self Esteem

The average S.E.I. scores for the two samples during each interview (TABLE 12) were similar to those reported by Bennett, Sorenson and Forshay (1971) and by Gendreau, Grant and Leipziger (1978).

TABLE 12: Average Self Esteem Scores

	First Interview	Second Interview	
Employed	30.98	32.89	$\bar{t}=2.36,$ $p < .05$
Non-employed	31.32	31.40	NS
	NS	NS	

There were no reliable differences between the self-esteem measures of the two samples during the first interview. The results also indicated that the non-employed inmates did not report a change in self-esteem over the duration of the study. The employed inmates did report an increase in self-esteem during the second session ( $\bar{t} = 2.36, p < .05$ ). This increase, however, does not appear to have been a result of involvement in the Abattoir Programme. Only those employed inmates who reported having a job available on release ( $N = 33$ ) showed an improvement in self-esteem ( $\bar{X} = 34.42, \bar{t} = 2.27, p < .05$ ). Those without a firm job prospect did not register an improvement. (A similar but statistically unreliable trend existed for the non-employed sample. Those with a firm job prospect showed more of an improvement in self-esteem ( $p = .059$ ) than those without available employment.) In addition, the highest self-esteem measures in the employed sample were from inmates who felt that the programme would not enhance their post-release employment potential. It appears, therefore, that improved pre-release self-esteem can be attributed not to the Abattoir Programme but to the availability of post-release employment.

G. Institutional Behaviour

Institutional conduct data based on the number of misconducts recorded in each inmate's file were compiled. The results indicate that prior to involvement in the study\*, the employed inmates including those eventually terminated had fewer misconducts than the non-employed inmates ( $\bar{t} = 5.16, p < .001$ ). The results also indicated that the employed inmates, who were eventually terminated, had more misconduct charges prior employment than the more "successful" inmates who were employed until their release from the institution ( $\bar{t} = 2.79, p < .01$ ).

\* For the employed sample, the date of employment was used, and for the non-employed sample the date of the first interview was used.

These findings indicate that to a certain extent, the selection process is successful in isolating those inmates with better institutional behaviour. In actuality, good institutional behaviour was one of the major selection criterion of the programme. It appears also that stricter criteria with regard to misconducts may further isolate those inmates who would be less likely to remain in the programme until release.

The trend for better institutional behaviour by the employed group appears to continue during the period of employment. Concrete data, however, were not available to provide conclusive evidence. The primary difficulty in this regard centres on a lack of confidence in the use of the number of misconducts as a measure of the behaviour of the employed inmates once they have entered the programme. Specifically, it became apparent that the consequences of a misconduct charge for those inmates at this point were far greater (removal from the programme) in some respects than for the regular inmates in the institution.\* It appears that there was a reluctance by the correctional officers to formally charge the inmates unless the violation was sufficiently serious to warrant the more severe consequences. It cannot be assumed, however, that the mere threat of removal was a sufficient deterrent. The data did indicate a non-reliable trend toward improvement in the institutional behaviour of the non-employed inmates. It is not possible, however, to attribute this improvement as an ancillary benefit of the Abattoir Programme.

#### H. Termination Interviews

Although the inmates who were terminated from the programme, prior to having been involved for at least three months, were essentially deleted from the study, it is of interest to make some comments on the total terminated sample.

One hundred and six inmates were terminated from the programme prior to the completion of their sentences. This represents 53% of the total intake in the employed sample. As indicated in TABLE 13, 28 inmates voluntarily withdrew because they either did not like the type of work or the institutional aspects associated with the programme and six resigned for medical reasons. The greatest proportion of voluntary withdrawals occurred prior to completion of at least three months in the programme. Seventy-two inmates were removed from the programme. Job-related issues (i.e., poor work performance) accounted for 31 terminations. Slightly more inmates (41) were removed from the programme because of institutional discipline violations. In total, 59% of the terminations occurred prior to the end of the third month of involvement in the programme.

---

\* *The difficulty in collecting comparative data on institutional behaviour was unfortunately detected too late in the research to have been circumvented.*

TABLE 13: Terminated Inmates: Reasons for Removal from the Programme.

	<u>Before 3 Months</u>	<u>After 3 Months</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>VOLUNTARILY WITHDREW</u>			
because of programme/work	22	6	28
medical reason	3	3	6
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>34</b>
<u>FIRED</u>			
job related	18	13	31
violated T.A.P.	20	21	41
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>72</b>

Of the total terminated inmates, 76 (72%) were available for a brief interview to discuss the termination. It is particularly striking that despite the relatively poor performance or dissatisfaction of these inmates, 97% of those who quit (N = 29) and 93% of those who were fired (N=67) all indicated support for the O.M.I.P. concept and a willingness to apply for similar future programmes. Eleven of the voluntary withdrawals and 10 of those fired indicated that under no circumstances would they return to work at the abattoir.

I. Predicted and Observed Problems

Information concerning perceived problems and concerns, resulting from the Abattoir Programme, are presented in TABLES 14 to 19. Generally speaking, few inmates in both samples predicted that serious problems would occur. The observations of the employed inmates, drawn from experiences in the programme, also indicate that the programme was not instrumental in producing negative effects.

TABLE 14: Increased Friction Between C.O. Staff and Inmates predictions and observations.

	<u>Non-employed predicted % (N=134)</u>	<u>Employed predicted % (N=104)</u>	<u>Employed observed % (N=68)</u>
More friction	16	10	4
Less friction	36	40	46

An increase in staff/inmate friction, as a result of the programme, was generally neither expected nor observed. Substantially, more inmates reported reductions in friction or no change in the status quo. The most frequent comments focussed on staff respect for and acknowledgement of the inmates' efforts. Many inmates reported the existence of already satisfactory relations with staff members, and others noted that involvement in the programme entailed less institutional visibility and, therefore, fewer confrontations. Staff resentment to change was the most frequently attributed source of increased friction.

TABLE 15: Incarceration Made More Difficult: predictions and observations.

	Non-employed predicted % (N=134)	Employed predicted % (N=104)	Employed observed % (N=68)
More difficult	13	12	3
Easier	62	76	90

The logistics and experience of incarceration was generally not seen as having been made more difficult by the inmates in both samples. The only criticisms levelled in this regard, concerned scheduling problems imposed by having to work outside the institution. Specifically, medical appointments and family visits were seen to have been adversely affected. Most of the inmates, however, commented that the programme made their time go faster, created a more relaxed atmosphere, made their time seem more constructive and facilitated frequent temporary weekend passes from the institution.

TABLE 16: The Company Will Have Difficulty Training Inmates: predictions and observations.

	Non-employed predicted % (N=134)	Employed predicted % (N=104)	Employed observed % (N=68)
Yes	12	13	10
No	84	85	90

Inmates in general felt that they were capable of working at levels demanded by the company. As to the quality of training provided, the most prevalent criticism was that there

was an absence of a training component to their employment and that inmates were only briefly shown their tasks and then were required to "pick it up on their own".\* Twelve employed inmates commented that the tasks given to them were easy and did not require any special training.

TABLE 17: Inmates Will be Treated Differently from Civilians: predictions and observations.

	Non-employed predicted % (N=134)	Employed predicted % (N=104)	Employed observed % (N=68)
Worse	33	35	41
No difference	50	57	59

The most frequent criticisms levelled at the programme were that inmates were treated differently from civilian employees. Criticisms in this regard included: still being considered inmates, receiving the "dirty jobs", being poorly paid, being more easily fired and having no option regarding overtime work.

TABLE 18: Conflicts Between Inmates and Civilians: predictions and observations.

	Non-employed predicted % (N=134)	Employed predicted % (N=104)	Employed observed % (N=68)
Yes	25	9	12
No	71	87	88

A greater proportion of non-employed inmates predicted conflicts between inmates and civilians at the abattoir ( $t = 3.34$ ,  $p < .01$ ). The employed sample's observations, however, did not

\* In all fairness to the present company, it should be noted that in late 1976, arrangements were made with Conestoga College to offer an accredited meat cutting course two nights per week in the institution. The plans fell through when only 8 inmates were interested, whereas, 12 were required as a minimum. 40 - 45 inmates were employed at the time. It appears that the inmates were reluctant to take advantage of a training programme when they discovered that it would be on their own time and within the institution rather than at the college.

differ from their predictions. Specific comments included a "bossy" attitude on the part of the civilians and civilians exhibiting a certain amount of resentment to having to work with inmates.

---

TABLE 19: Tension Between Employed Inmates and Regular Inmates: predictions and observations.

	Non-employed predicted % (N=134)	Employed predicted % (N=104)	Employed observed % (N=68)
Yes	22	25	19
No	76	72	81

---

The majority of the inmates neither predicted nor reported increased tension between the inmates in the Abattoir Programme and the other inmates remaining in the institution. Many commented that all inmates are aware of their eligibility if interested. A few, however, indicated that some jealousy was created over pay differences and priveleges. One inmate specifically commented on pressures on the employed inmates to supply contraband to the remaining inmate population.

A number of other problems were indicated by some of the inmates. In particular, the housing arrangement in the institution was criticized. It was felt by some inmates that it would be better to lodge the O.M.I.P. inmates in a separate facility or institution removed from the regular inmates. Other problems referred to include repetitive lunches (no variety),\* poor safety in the abattoir, and forced overtime for the inmates but not civilians. In addition, the programme was criticized because the waiting list of inmate applicants allows the company to easily fire inmates without threat of disruption to production. A number of inmates complained about the complicated system used for re-admitting the inmates to the institution after work. The criticism was not so much because of the time entailed, which was often lengthy, but because they were forced to wait in the visitors' waiting area, still dressed in their dirty work clothes. One criticism made by only a couple of inmates, but worthy of mention, was the fact that in the abattoir, the inmates continue to wear the "prison blues" and were thus distinguished from the civilians.

---

\* The specific issue regarded the fact that the inmates felt that they were being given the same types of sandwiches and dessert for their lunches. They preferred more variety and the opportunity for "hot lunches".

## V DISCUSSION

The results of the present study are both encouraging and disconcerting. The failure to demonstrate a substantial impact of the Abattoir Programme on the participants is disappointing but there are some reassuring indications of unexpectedly favourable attitudes.

It is clear from the demographic and criminal history data that the two inmate samples are homogeneous with only a few appreciable differences. The homogeneity is also generally evident in all of the attitude measures taken. From a research perspective, the close similarity of the two groups is encouraging and engenders confidence that an adequate comparison group was mustered. The distinction of the target population as older, married, better behaved and having a more stable work history, is consistent with earlier similar groups (Rudoff and Esselstyn 1973) and attests to the veracity of the selection process. The use of this group as the de facto target population supports earlier staff contentions (Irvine, 1977) of an inherent elitism in the programme. Specifically, some officers observed that the programme was selecting inmates who least needed rehabilitative intervention and who were most likely to succeed independent of the programme.

Although no substantial improvements in attitudes about work in general can be attributed to the programme, it is evident that the general attitudes, held by the inmates in both samples, were remarkably positive. The results indicate that inmate attitudes concerning work in general and the potential impact of the Abattoir Programme, tended to be both unanimous and favourable. Indeed, the results do not support the traditionally held view that inmates are poorly motivated workers holding attitudes incompatible with adequate work performance. The attitudes, including a dislike of unemployment, a need for work satisfaction and a willingness to take any job within reason, cannot be judged to be drastically different from those of most civilian workers. At first glance, the programme appears to have failed to improve inmate attitudes concerning work in general. However, since the attitudes held by the inmates were already at acceptable levels, very little improvement could be expected under any circumstances.

As would be anticipated, personal experience, particularly a criminal record, was most frequently considered to be a prohibitive factor in employment search. A lack of skills, experience and education were also regarded as problems hampering job success. These findings are consistent with general assumptions of inmate shortcomings and are anticipated and addressed by most correctional industrial programmes. It is disturbing, however, that as many as 86 (36%) of the inmates in the total sample, lack the more fundamental and basic skills required to successfully obtain employment. Indecisiveness and an inability to even initiate a job search were revealed by many inmates. This implies a need for expanded life skills programmes to be incorporated in institutional industrial programmes. Poor work attitudes, therefore, do not appear to be causal factors in sporadic work histories. Rehabilitative programmes should not only address themselves to any possible attitude improvement but also to the provision of education, skills and improved abilities to conduct job searches.

Attitudes concerning the Abattoir Programme and future private industrial involvement, were neither affected by involvement in the programme nor viewed differently by the inmates in the two samples. The inmates also reported a remarkable concurrence with the correctional officers (Irvine 1977) in expressing a high acceptance, endorsement and optimism concerning both the process and likely outcome of the programme.

Because of the longitudinal nature of the research, many of the second interviews, for many inmates, were conducted prior to a large proportion of the initial interviews for other inmates, who entered the programme at a subsequent date. The similarity of inmate attitudes could, therefore, have resulted from the "grapevine" of communication that would ensure that all inmates would be familiar with the programme via the experience of those more directly involved. Thus, most inmates during the first interview had no misconceptions about the programme and were unlikely to substantially alter their impressions. This argument is supported by the fact that often current, contentious issues were raised as potential problems during the first interview. It is the suspicion of the researcher, that indications, by a majority of the inmates, that they "knew very little" about the programme, are misleading. On the contrary, it is likely that they were quite familiar but only felt that they lacked complete information regarding the programme.

The employed inmates reported a beneficial impact in a number of areas. Attributed to the programme were a more constructive use of incarceration, ease in "doing time", improved post-release employment potential and a general increased willingness to work. In contrast, the Ministry Managed Industrial Programmes were considered to be of lesser value. Although few inmates criticized these programmes for having deleteriously affected their job potential, there were few reports of a beneficial impact in any dimension. By all accounts, therefore, the Abattoir Programme was considered to be a highly desirable alternative to the other existing industrial programmes.

Most of the employed inmates corroborated earlier predictions by staff members (Irvine 1977) of the beneficial impact of paying realistic wages to inmates. The majority of the married inmates and some single and divorced inmates reported having forwarded earnings to family members, resulting generally in improved relations. A small proportion (17%) reported stress concerning abuse of the money by their spouses. The issue of the fiscal responsibility of the families has never really been considered before, but is especially important vis a vis plans, by the Ministry, to expand on programmes oriented to the provision of continued financial support. The present data suggest that future safeguards be imposed to ensure proper use of the support. Many inmates reported that having accumulated savings eased the stress of incarceration and facilitated the ability to realistically set future plans. Only a small percentage intended to waste or abuse their savings. The remainder had made positive and constructive plans. This proportion who intended to waste their earnings is probably no greater than one would expect in the general population.

It was not a primary goal of the programme to produce a number of potential meat industry workers. It is interesting, therefore, that many inmates were interested in continuing in this line of work. This implies that these inmates derived something useful from their experiences and that anticipations that the work would be unpleasant, dissipated with experience.

It is expected that in any correctional programme, a number of inmates will be unsuccessful and for a variety of reasons. Never-the-less, it is discouraging that slightly more than half of all employed inmates either withdrew or were dismissed from the programme prior to release from the institution. The most frequent problem with dismissals centered around the restrictions imposed by temporary absence from the institution. Following selection into the programme, many inmates were unable to adhere to the T.A.P. regulations and restrictions. Indeed it was generally found that issues, unrelated to the abattoir per se, promoted the majority of the terminations. In view of apprehensions that existed concerning the ability of inmates to adequately perform in the industry, it is encouraging that only 15% of the total employed sample were dismissed as unsuitable by the company. A certain proportion of workers, in any industry, will be judged unsuitable and it cannot be assumed that the present findings are inordinate. Similarly, and because of the nature of abattoir work, it is acceptable that some inmates voluntarily withdrew from the programme because of a dislike for the work. For many of the inmates, dissatisfaction stemmed from discrepancies between expectations and experiences. The discrepancy in the present programme can be exemplified by the absence of choice regarding the tasks assigned. Many inmates were disappointed and thus less willing to make the effort when given a less attractive duty than expected.

It is important to note, however, that despite the discouraging record for keeping inmates involved, almost all of the terminated inmates endorsed the O.M.I.P. concept and expressed an interest in similar future programmes. In fact, many were interested, in principle, in returning to the Abattoir Programme. Others were unwilling under any circumstances.

The present findings with the Self-Esteem Inventory are compatible with Bennett's (1974) observation of an absence of systematic change in self-esteem during incarceration. Involvement in the Abattoir Programme does not appear to have facilitated improvements in self-esteem. Consistent with Bennett's conclusions, and based solely on the S.E.I. data, it is not anticipated that the employed sample inmates will exhibit greater post-release success. Those inmates, in both samples, with a firm post-release job prospect, reported the highest pre-release self-esteem. It is expected that these inmates will report the greatest post-release success.

## VI PROBLEMS AND SUGGESTIONS

Generally speaking, few problems were attributed to the programme by the inmates. This is particularly encouraging in light of the obvious changes in routine within the institution that would occur as a result of the implementation and the fact that as a new, attractive programme, the potential for disappointment and confused expectations is great. A list of specific recommendations for future O.M.I.P. consideration is provided. This list reflects many of the criticisms leveled at the programme by the inmates. It is not intended to be exhaustive nor can all of the recommendations be implemented in a single programme.

(1) Provide realistic, useful training

A contentious issue in the present study revolved around the perceived absence of real training for the inmates. For the majority of inmates, only menial tasks requiring little or no training (i.e., sanitation) were available and there was only limited opportunity to acquire special skills.

(2) Clearly specify target goals

In order to accurately be termed a 'programme' as opposed to an 'activity', clearly stated, identifiable and measurable goals are needed. Focussing on specific target criteria will facilitate the programme design and will assist implementers to develop plausible causalities of goal achievement as well as scrutinize the inherent assumptions of the programme. Furthermore, clear goals will assist in the identification of appropriate participants.

(3) Select the most appropriate inmates

Care should be taken to ensure that the target population is the most appropriate for the expressed goals of the programme. In the present programme, "model" inmates were generally selected, a factor which likely contributed to minimal results in goal achievement. It is not necessary to preclude the better than average inmate but it is suggested that other inmates, whose specific needs are addressed by the programme, be included.

(4) Maximize communication

A well documented outline of the mutual obligations between the inmates and the company should be provided. This would provide the various grounds for dismissal and would reduce some of the discrepancies in expectations

experienced in the present programme. The 'grape-vine' of communication cannot be depended upon for accuracy of information. Communication of reasons for rejection should be given to unsuccessful applicants in order to enhance their potential in future applications.

(5) Avoid temporary absence from the institution

A major difficulty in the unsuccessful cases was the failure to adapt to temporary absence regulations. Many of these inmates might have been otherwise quite successful. The O.M.I.P. concept originally specified the use of industries within the confines of the institution, thus future programmes may not encounter this difficulty. There is a trade-off, however. Many inmates may have benefited from the trust implicit in temporary absence.

(6) Investigate the optimum numbers of inmates to be involved

Incompatible with provisions of realistic work experiences are tendencies to maximize the numbers of inmates involved in the programme. Large numbers of inmates tend to promote the psychological barriers and hamper the impact of the realistic experience. This, however, identifies a dilemma experienced by the Ministry. While minimal numbers of inmates involved in programmes would likely maximize the impact on the incumbents, there is a responsibility by the Ministry to provide positions in the programmes for as many inmates as possible.

(7) Establish permanent housing facilities prior to the implementation of the programme

It can be argued that a "spin-off" of benefits from programme inmates to non-employed inmates would result from having the two groups housed together. No specific recommendations in this regard are possible. However, regardless of the decided arrangement, the housing should be established prior to the commencement of the programme. Present experience, which involved two separate relocations, revealed an adverse impact on some inmates' responses to the programme.

(8) Ensure that the inmates are not treated differently from civilians

To provide a more realistic work environment, the absence of differential treatment is crucial. Inmates in the present programme complained of wage differences, a tendency of the civilians to be 'bossy' and having to dress differently. These impressions can only have a deleterious effect on the programme's potential.

(9) Ensure continued family support

Inmate wages should be regulated to ensure that family responsibilities are met and that where applicable, wives are removed from public assistance. Results of the present study reveal that the majority of inmates who contributed to the support, report a beneficial impact on marital relations. Additional safeguards, possibly through counselling, should be imposed to guarantee proper spending of the financial assistance, by the spouses.

(10) Assist post-release employment search

Inmates could be provided with a list of industries which could possibly use the training received by the inmates. This would ease the transition to the community and would reduce problems experienced by those unable to begin a job search.

(11) Provide adequate meals for inmates

Even though work shifts may not conform to regular kitchen hours, the inmates should never-the-less receive the same quality and variety of food as the regular inmates. Meals are sufficiently important to inmates, that a failure to provide this can affect inmate willingness to participate in the programmes.

## VII EVALUABILITY OF THE ABATTOIR PROGRAMME

It is evident that the present research did not demonstrate any measureable impact of the Abattoir Programme. This failure could be attributed to the interaction of several factors. Prior to conducting a programme evaluation, a researcher, in conjunction with the programme managers, must make some critical decisions regarding the nature of the research to be carried out. The emphasis will be either on process evaluation or on outcome evaluation. Outcome evaluation is only possible if satisfactory answers can be obtained to the following questions:

- 1) What is the target population and what are the target behaviours to be changed?
- 2) What are the processes that impinge on the programme participants that will affect change?
- 3) What theoretical basis is there to suppose that these processes will in fact have any effect on the target behaviours?
- 4) What is the minimum amount of time required for these processes to achieve any change?
- 5) What are the characteristics of a person who has successfully participated in the programme? (i.e., What are the short-term and long-term outcome criteria?).

Collectively, the answers to these questions define the 'impact model' of the programme. The importance of ensuring that they can be answered is evident, in that there is no programme, strictly defined, if there is no clearly specified 'impact model'. In the absence of a clearly defined impact model or programme, outcome evaluation would not only be inappropriate but also meaningless. A process evaluation, monitoring the activities, would be more suitable and can be used to develop an 'impact model', if, in fact, one is possible.

The present data must be viewed as being within the process model of research, for, as will be shown, answers to the above critical questions are not readily available and that the data, therefore, demonstrate that there is no programme suitable for outcome evaluation.

The selection procedure for the programme isolated the more stable inmates who tended to be older, married with dependents and with more stable work histories. In addition, they exhibited better institutional behaviour. The goals of providing a 'real' work environment, training and improved habits and attitudes are based on the assumption that inmates generally have poor work attitudes and poor work histories. Even if these assumptions were correct, the programme was likely to produce only minimal results by selecting inmates who generally were not deficient in the target behaviours. The data of the present study suggest that the assumption themselves appear to have been faulty. The real needs of the inmates seem to be in the nature of skills, training and the ability to conduct job searches. The selection of 'model' inmates, as the

de facto target population, albeit advantageous for the company, conflicts with the original purpose for the programme and is incompatible with the expressed target behaviours. The observation of improvement is least likely with inmates who are already closest to the ideal and most likely to succeed without programme intervention. The Abattoir Programme could not be expected to show great achievement by addressing itself to the wrong target behaviours and then selecting the least appropriate inmates.

Intrinsic to any new and innovative rehabilitation or social action programme, is the need for clearly stated long-term and short-term goals. This is absent in the present programme. Missing also is a clear articulation of the programme, with plausible causal assumptions as to how the various programme goals will be achieved. There are no theoretical bases offered as rationale for expecting that the processes will produce the desired changes in the target behaviours. Many of the stated goals cannot be accepted as real outcomes or impacts, but are really statements of activity or processes. These 'goals' include the provision of a realistic work environment, suitable remuneration and training. Even as processes, however, they cannot be truly realized in the Abattoir Programme, as currently operated. A realistic work experience can only be expressed in relation to the alternative, Ministry managed programmes. Indeed, with as many as 50 inmates employed with only slightly more civilians, real work experience and assimilation of civilian "work ethics", if possible, would be limited at best. Furthermore, the inmate identity is psychologically perpetuated by keeping the inmates dressed in the distinctive "prison blues".

The provision of suitable wages for inmates was a source of discontent from some of the inmates. Understandably, the non-employed inmates resented the wage differential but some of the employed inmates resented being paid less than the civilians\*. Although the wages may have reflected work performance, undue discrepancies, without adequate explanation, fall short of a real-life work situation. If perceived as a discriminatory tactic, it can only have a deleterious effect on attitudes. The provision of training was judged to be inadequate by many of the inmates. Although many of the tasks required little or no training, the need for useful skills remains. Being a stated goal of the programme, a closer scrutiny needs to be paid to the eventual increase in useable skills.

In failing to adequately satisfy the critical pre-conditions, the Abattoir Programme falls short of technically being a 'programme' and, as such, was not ready for effectiveness measures. Evaluative research, in terms of the programme outcomes, was inappropriate at this time. Throughout the study period, there were serious disruptions and modifications in the programme. Although a new programme can be expected to undergo some changes, empirical research is rendered essentially invalid by a programme which cannot be held constant. Some of the more serious

---

\* Since the union intervention, the wages for civilians and inmates have been equalized.

modifications include the change in companies (resulting in a two month suspension of the programme), two transfers of inmate housing within the institution, and more recently, the involvement of a labour union in the abattoir\*. The selection criteria also appear to have fluctuated. Some inmates, originally rejected by the company, were subsequently hired upon re-application at a later date\*\*. Adequate evaluation of these unanticipated changes was not possible within the scope of the present research. It has to be assumed, however, that some impact, as a result of these changes, had to be felt by either the inmates or the institution.

It is not uncommon that researchers and programme managers have different criteria of success. The present research has sought to assess the programme along behavioural and attitudinal dimensions while employing generally accepted, but quite stringent, probability criteria. The programme managers may also have other concerns; for example, economic factors, the absence of adverse effects or less stringent outcome criteria.

A more serious problem is the vagueness of the actual goals, rendering adequate criteria measurement impossible. Some stated goals of the programme, (improved work habits, work attitudes and post-release circumstances) were legitimately termed 'goals' but were also not clearly specified. Absent were clear indications of acceptable criterion levels of success versus the unacceptable levels that were assumed to be prevalent. In addition, there were no indications as to the expected length of time needed to achieve the goals, nor were distinctions made concerning short-term and long-term effects. The present data indicate that inmate general work attitudes were quite acceptable prior to intervention. Closer attention, therefore, was needed to assess and specify the goals as well as the underlying assumptions of the programme. From the inmates' perspective, it is a highly desirable alternative to and reduces the impact of conventional incarceration. From the institution's point of view, there is a high potential for improved inmate management. However, factors beyond the control of both inmates and the institution can potentially intervene and dramatically alter both the situation and its impact. This is due to the fact that there is no inherent stability in a situation which is so unstructured. A movement toward a needed stability and, indeed, programme definition, can be made via process evaluation and upon 'stabilization', if it is in fact possible, a more judgmental, outcome evaluation could be conducted.

All is not lost, however, and the above comments should not be interpreted as an indication that the programme cannot achieve its goals. Never-the-less, much work is required to ensure that the Abattoir Programme be transformed into a more worthwhile activity for both the institution and the inmates. In particular, the conditions set by the five critical questions noted above, should be met.

---

\* The emergence of labour union intervention occurred after the inmate data collection but is included as an example of the magnitude of change in the programme.

\*\* Occasionally a pressing need for more inmate workers resulted in the company reversing its own earlier decisions not to hire some inmates.

The goals should be clearly specified in a manner which affords adequate criterion measurement. Those goals whose underlying assumptions cannot be supported by empirical research and theoretical perspective, should be abandoned. A greater conception of the characteristics of the target population, including what is expected as an outcome, should be made. Other areas, referred to throughout this report, warrant further scrutiny during attempts to re-vitalize the programme. It is hoped that once this re-direction is accomplished, a greater indication of goal achievement will be realized.

REFERENCES

- Bennett, L. A. (1974), Self-esteem and parole adjustment. Criminology, 1974, 12 (3), 346-360.
- Bennett, L. A., Sorenson, D. E. and Forshay, H. (1971), The application of self-esteem measures in a correctional setting: I. Reliability of the scale and relationship to other measures. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 1971, 8, 1-9.
- Crispino, L. (1974), The Temporary Absence Programme for Employment: A Study of Benefits. Planning and Research Branch, Ministry of Correctional Services, Province of Ontario, 1974.
- Gendreau, P., Gibson, M., Surridge, C. T. and Hug, J. J. (1973), The application of self-esteem measures in corrections: A further report on the S.E.I. Journal of Community Psychology, 1973, 1 (4), 423-425.
- Gendreau, P., Grant, B. A. and Leipziger, M. (1978), Self-esteem, incarceration and recidivism. Criminal Justice and Behaviour, 1978, in press.
- Hug, J. J. (1971), A First Year Examination of Educational and Employment Temporary Absence Programmes. Research Branch, Department of Correctional Services, Province of Ontario, 1971.
- Irvine, M. J. (1977), The Guelph Abattoir Programme: An Innovative Approach to Correctional Industries. I. Staff Response. Planning and Research Branch, Ministry of Correctional Services, Province of Ontario, 1977.
- Jeffery, R. and Woolpert, S. (1974), Work Furlough as an Alternative to incarceration: An examination of its effects on recidivism and social cost. The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 1974, 65 (3), 405-415.
- Rudoff, A. and Esselstyn, T. C. (1973), Evaluating Work Furlough: A Follow-up, Federal Probation, June 1973, 52.
- Singer, N. M. (1973), Incentives and the Use of Prison Labour. Crime and Delinquency, April 1973, 200-211.

APPENDIX A

Inmate general work attitudes

- 1) There are plenty of jobs available and I would rather work than collect unemployment insurance (97.25%)
- 2) I feel good when I've completed a good day's work (94.0%)
- 3) When things go well at work, I am happiest (92.25%)
- 4) At the end of the day, after working hard, I have a sense of accomplishment (91.5%)
- 5) I get satisfaction in doing a day's work (87.75%)
- 6) I won't just take a job that I've been trained for (87.25%)
- 7) The main reason why I work is so I can have money to do things other than basic necessities (86.0%)
- 8) I would feel loyal to the company I worked for (84.25%)
- 9) I'm not going to wait for the right job just because of the training I have (82.25%)
- 10) If I'm not working or am idle at work, I get restless and bored (81.75%)
- 11) I have a special goal or purpose in life (80.75%)
- 12) I would not work overtime without extra pay or salary (76.75%)
- 13) I am willing to settle down to a permanent job in the near future (75.5%)
- 14) I like competition in my work (75.5%)
- 15) I would work for anyone or do anything if I had to (73.75%)
- 16) I am ready for a long term commitment to a job (71.75%)
- 17) I work more because I like to than because I have to (70.25%)
- 18) I would not feel guilty collecting Unemployment Insurance (70.25%)
- 19) I would not like to stay at one job forever (70.25%)
- 20) I want to be my own boss (70.0%)
- 21) Besides money I expect satisfaction and enjoyment from my work (67.75%)
- 22) I would rather work at something I don't like than collect Unemployment Insurance (66.25%)
- 23) A person should not have to work for the minimum wage (65.25%)
- 24) I don't want to take time off to spend the money I made (63.25%)

- 25) I won't just take a job at something I enjoy doing (58.5%)
- 26) I like a job where there is more to do than you can get done in a normal work day (58.25%)
- 27) The minimum wage is beneath a person's dignity (56.25%)
- 28) I would not want the same job for life (55%)
- 29) Being unemployed would drive me mad (55%)
- 30) If I could earn \$7.00/hr., I would take any job (54.5%)
- 31) I would not work for less than \$3.50/hr. (54.24%)
- 32) I am choosy about the jobs I take (53.0%)
- 33) I won't mind being unemployed for awhile (52.25%)
- 34) I would not work for just anyone who would hire me (51.75%)
- 35) I would not agree to have to pass night school courses before getting a raise (51.25%)
- 36) I would work even if the physical conditions suited my needs (50.75%)

**END**