WHAT WORKS WITH YOUNG OFFENDERS: SUMMARIZING THE LITERATURE

Alan W. Leschied, Ph.D. C. Psych.*

I. ACCUMULATING EVIDENCE FOR ASSESSMENT AND REHABILITATION IN THE YOUNG OFFENDER FIELD

In a recently published summary of the accumulation of evidence on assessment and treatment in the young offender area, Leschied and Cunningham (1999) noted that more articles have been published regarding young offender assessment and treatment in the past ten years (1988-1998) than were documented on major literature data bases during the years prior to 1988. What this points to, is not only an increasing empirical basis for decision making regarding placement and treatment targets, but as well, an indication of the vast knowledge base which practitioners need to be aware of, in designing assessment and treatment strategies.

A. General Principals from the Assessment Literature

The following sections will detail findings related to the specifics of young offender assessment that include general as well as specific issues of assessment and classification. The status of the general literature with youth, similar to what Andrews (1990) suggests with the major predictors for adults at risk, is now relatively apparent and continues to reinforce findings reported in recent cross-sectional and longitudinal studies by Farrington and Loeber (1999). This trend suggests that there is a move away from the findings of general personality theory that may have driven much of the research evidence through to the early 1980's (e.g. such as Megargee's MMPI classification system) to a more *risk specific* means of offender classification. Further, specific assessment strategies have now been developed and implemented for specific purposes of young offender management. These include offence-specific assessments ranging from the assessment of adolescent male sex offenders to the management of youth in various security levels in detention facilities. Presentation of these assessment strategies will be presented.

B. General Principals from the Treatment Literature

Similar to the assessment literature, increasing knowledge with respect to young offender management and treatment has also been witnessed over the past decade. Progress in this area has capitalized not only on the specific effects of young offender programmes, but from the general knowledge base regarding child and adolescent intervention as well. Kazdin and Weisz (1998) noted in their review of child and adolescent interventions, that expressions such as *knowledge-based*, *data-driven* and *empirically-supported* now routinely appear in selections made regarding treatment options for specific client groups. Knowledge with respect to successful programmes for conduct-disordered and anti-social youth has progressed not only in the description of successful *components* of intervention (i.e.

* Professor, Faculty of Education, University of Western Ontario, London Ontario, CANADA

cognitive-behavioral) but also in the method of *service delivery* (custody versus community). Descriptions of promising programmes are presented that can guide general decisions with respect to youth management. Specific service components are also detailed that can help guide placement decisions in regard to the *context* in which more successful programmes can be offered.

1. Developing Intensive Community-
    Based Services for Higher Risk Youth
    While considerable emphasis is being given to 'front-end' services primarily targeting lower risk offenders, there is also support for developing services addressing the needs of higher risk cases who would otherwise be heading towards a custody disposition. Justification for community-based services must first have, as its yardstick, the ability to deliver cost-effective service that does not compromise the community's safety. A key intention of the Canadian Department of Justice (1998), with its proposed framework for youth justice reform, is to lower the rates of custody ordered in Canadian youth courts. This cannot be accomplished through law reform alone. Members of the public in general, and sentencing judges specifically, must be convinced of several things. First, incapacitation through custody may protect the public in the short term but evidence does not support reductions in offending through incapacitation in the long term (Andrews, *et.al.*, 1990). Second, there are viable community-based alternatives to custody that can both protect the public in the short term and reduce recidivism in the long term. Third, the expensive option of custody will not 'purchase' as much reduction in offending as these other non-custodial sentencing options. This review will outline the choice of interventions such as Multisystemic Therapy (MST) as

a viable alternative to custody for high-risk young offenders.

2. Systemic and Programmatic
    Requirements for Effective Service

(i) *Summary from the Meta-Analyses*
     Meta-analysis is the term used to report *quantitative* summaries of the literature. It represents a significant advancement over earlier qualitative reviews (Wells,1991). Meta-analysis statistically compares the types of treatments that are offered, to whom they are directed and with what outcomes. The meaningfulness of meta-analysis is only limited by the number and quality of the studies that are included in the review. Fortunately, adequate quality and quantity of studies now exist to make interpretations of the treatment literature in youth justice with confidence, although Losel (1997) has offered up some reservations with respect to limiting the generalizeability of such findings. The limitations along with the major outcomes will be summarized in the following section.

(ii) *Major Outcomes from the Meta-Analysis*
      Meta-analytic reviews of the outcome literature support the desirability of providing programmes that are related to the causes of crime (Andrews *et al.*, 1990; Lipsey and Wilson, 1998; Gendreau and Goggin, 1996). Sanctions provided independent of appropriate rehabilitative efforts have failed to demonstrate significant reductions in offending. These reviews have given rise to a clearer understanding of both the systemic requirements for the delivery of effective service as well as the programmatic requirements to provide meaningful reductions in youth recidivism.

Andrews *et al.* (1990) identified the importance of matching the *intensity of service* to the *relative risk* and need of individual offenders. The *Risk Principle of Case Classification*, a useful means to allocate service, suggests that intensive services are more meaningfully delivered to high-risk youth, while low-risk youth can be safely assigned to less intensive services such as community service, fines, restitution and low-level community monitoring. Inappropriate matching of service to risk level will, accordingly, be seen as an ineffective, non-productive use of services that can further the criminogenic risk of some youths (Andrews *et al.*, 1990). There is evidence to suggest that, in the province of Ontario for example, sentencing judges are inclined to place in custody a disproportionate number of youths who would be assessed as low risk for further offending (Hoge, Andrews and Leschied, 1995). Differential association theorists would warn that placing low-risk offenders with high-risk offenders could well adversely affect their risk for reoffending.

Lessons learned, therefore, from the meta-analysis on systemic variables in effective programming for youth corrections suggest that:

- Lower risk cases can be safely assigned to less intensive services
- Higher risk cases are more effectively dealt with in more intensive services
- The differential assignment of youth according to risk is critical

Accordingly, a spectrum of services to address youths at all levels of risk and need would be a very desirable characteristic of any youth correctional system.

(iii) *Findings on Programme Components of Effective Service*

Research has also addressed the programmatic components of correctional interventions for youth by identifying the content and quality of effective programmes (for a detailed review see Andrews, Leschied and Hoge, 1992). Components of effective programmes are assessed in relation to their ability to meaningfully reduce recidivism within the targeted group. Programmes assessed as effective tend to be those that systematically assess risk in clients, use the risk principle of case classification, adopt programme orientations known to be effective, employ well educated and well trained staff, monitor programme integrity and adherence to the intervention model used, and rigorously evaluate the extent to which programme goals are met. Cognitive-behavioural interventions are often identified as having the greatest promise in reducing recidivism when compared with other programming orientations (e.g., Vennard, Sugg and Hedderman, 1997).

Discussion therefore in identifying appropriate young offender service needs to be mindful of the eight integrity issues summarized by Andrews *et al.* (1990). According to these authors, a coherent and empirically defensible model:

- empirically links interventions with desired outcomes;
- assesses risk and need levels of clients and targets them for intervention;

- has a detailed programme manual outlining the discreet steps involved in the intervention;
- ensures that therapists have structured and formal training in relevant theory and practice;
- ensures that therapists are supervised in a meaningful manner;
- assesses the therapeutic process as delivered to monitor the adherence to key principles and the employment of techniques claimed to be employed;
- conducts assessments of intermediate changes in values, skills or circumstances of clients that are presumed to relate to desired outcome(s); and,
- associates the level and intensity of intervention to risk, need and responsivity.

3. Institutional Versus Non-Institutional Placement for Treatment

Lipsey and Wilson's (1997) review distinguished placement of treatment, residential versus community, in differentiating characteristics of effective programmes. This is a critical differentiation since much of the debate regarding effective youth justice policies centre on the importance of incarceration as a relevant factor in community safety. Lipsey and Wilson noted in their analysis that different contributions are made for various components of service as a function of the placement for treatment. Table 1 summarizes factors relevant for effective programmes in institutional and non-institutional placements.

Table 1
Programme Factors Contributing to Effectiveness for Institutionalized and Non- Institutionalized Young Offenders

Institutional-Based Components
Interpersonal Skills Teaching Family Model Multiple Services Behavioural Programmes Individual/Group Programmes
Non-Institutional-Based Components
Interpersonal Skills Individual/ Group Programmes Multiple Services Restitution/Probation Employment/Academic Programmes

Effect sizes accounting for total programme outcome across both institutional and non-institutional programmes suggested that the three factors comprising the highest ranking were; interpersonal skills training, individual counselling and behavioral programmes. The second grouping of lesser, yet significant contribution were the two programme factors consisting of multimodal services and restitution for youths on probation.

The work of Don Andrews and his colleagues (Andrews, Zinger, Hoge, Bonta, Gendreau and Cullen, 1990); Andrews, Leschied and Hoge, 1992) were consistent with the findings of Lipsey. However Andrews' work provides more specificity in regards to appropriate targeting for intervention - known as the risk principle - and increasing sophistication regarding style and type of intervention, namely the importance of cognitive-behavioural oriented interventions. On a broader level, Andrews' work outlined characteristics of promising programmes as including:

- Employment of systematic assessment that emphasizes factors relevant to criminality
- Possess therapeutic integrity
- Attend to relapse prevention
- Target appropriately
- Employ appropriate styles of service

With the number and consistency of analyses pointing to factors that relate to effective strategies for reducing youthful offending, considerable attention is now being directed at developing efforts that effectively disseminate and sustain the components of effective programmes. The following section draws on findings that are being reported in the forthcoming book edited by Gary Bernfeld, David Farrington and Alan Leschied through John Wiley Press entitled, "Implementing Effective Correctional Programmes".

II. OVERVIEW OF MAJOR FINDINGS FROM THE META-ANALYSIS

In the mid and latter 1970's, reviews of the programme literature in corrections contributed to an extraordinary discussion that became the touch stone to a generation of corrections professionals. The *nothing works debate* as it is been popularly known, not only became a matter for social scientists to consider, but also played into the hands of policy makers and politicians in criminal justice. Depending upon their particular political leaning, decision makers used the results of such reviews to either proclaim the failure of rehabilitation, thereby perhaps unwittingly heralding the expanded use of get tough measures, or used them to develop the growing science of prediction and treatment in the corrections field. Followers of the debate will now be familiar with the names of Robert Martinson (1976) in the U.S. and in Canada, Jalal Shamsie (1979) whose titles of qualitative reviews of the literature so provocatively proclaimed that "Nothing Worked" and that "Our Treatments Do Not Work: Where do We Go From Here". And with each provocation, there was a Paul Gendreau, Robert Ross (1979) or Ted Palmer (1996) who suggested that a more careful reading of the outcome literature would provide "Bibliotherapy for Cynics".

Two decades have now passed, and with more sophistication in providing *quantitative reviews* of the prediction and outcome literature, meta-analyses have assisted in developing a *science of criminal conduct*. Such a science draws not only on linking factors that help in the understanding of *criminogenic risk levels* of certain individuals - nature and strength - but also on the literature regarding treatments or systems of service delivery that can promote effective outcomes in correctional practice. The following section highlights some of the major findings from the meta-analyses that relates to implementation.

A. Contributions from the Meta-Analyses

There have been a number of contributions to the meta-analysis on corrections treatment. Perhaps the most well-known are those authored by Don Andrews and his colleagues (1990) and by Mark Lipsey (Lipsey and Wilson, 1993; Lipsey 1995). Technical understanding of the approach taken by these authors will not be provided here. Suffice to say that the quality and nature of the meta-analyses that are reported reflect the quality and number of the studies in the field. Hence, the nature and quality of knowledge could not have been achieved and reported on by Andrews and Lipsey were it not for the efforts of so many who contributed to that knowledge base.

B. Major Assessment Issues in Implementation

Both cross-sectional and longitudinal studies have identified factors that link past or current conditions with individuals that place them at increasing risk for criminogenic involvement. Andrews and Bonta (1998) suggest that these studies support a *social-psychological understanding* of criminogenic risk. That is, individuals may cognitively process certain conditions in their environment that develop or reward certain styles or content of thinking that are reflected in anti-social behaviour. Those system variables that influence risk to a greater extent include the following:

- families of origin,
- peer associates, and
- school or working conditions.

Data has also supported the link between anti-social behaviour with substance use in the understanding of crime cycles (Huizinga, Menard and Elliott, 1989). Measures of those factors that contribute most significantly and seem to be attracting the greatest attention in the literature include multi-factored indicators as measured by the Level of Service Inventory (Andrews and Bonta, 1999), the Risk - Need Inventory (Hoge, Leschied and Andrews, 1996),criminal sentiments (Simourd, 1999) and psychopathy (Hare, 1991).

C. Assessing for Criminogenic Risk

Accurate and relevant assessment of criminogenic risk is tied to the major outcomes from the meta-analysis on effective treatment. While Lipsey has identified the major *general* contributors to successful correctional programmes, Andrews, *et.al*.'s principle contribution rests in the refining of understanding regarding the appropriate target of intervention. While Lipsey's results were encouraging regarding the average effect sizes supporting reductions of 10-30 per cent in re-offending within particular types of programming (i.e. behavioral over psychodynamic), Andrews' findings that certain programme components targeted to specific criminogenic risk factors - referred to as clinical relevance - could improve outcomes by an even greater extent. Hence, Andrews articulated the *risk principle of case classification* as a critical component of effective service thereby linking assessment with service delivery in the overall approach to effective correctional treatment. These findings therefore suggest that assessment of appropriate risk relevant to criminal justice involvement are a necessary and fundamental part of successful programme implementation. The following section will begin to address the structural models of conceptualizing implementation issues based on the empirical findings from the meta-analysis.

III. PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION AS A SCIENCE IN ITS OWN RIGHT

A. Dissemination of Effective Programme Strategies:

Technology Transfer in the Human Service Field[1]

The transfer of knowledge in the social and human services from what has largely been an academic-based knowledge to applied settings is challenging not only to correctional professionals, but to practitioners in a variety of human service settings. The literature chronicles numerous examples of programmes that were either well conceived and poorly implemented or well implemented but poorly sustained (Bauman, Stein and Ireys, 1991). Of course, there is also the suspicion that the failure to implement or sustain correctional programmes that have demonstrated effectiveness in research may be tied to the more insidious, cynical intentions of some policy and programme 'experts'. This has more to do with the unwillingness of such administrators to disavow the knowledge base in a given area and indeed purposefully undermine the integrity of that knowledge. Andrews and Bonta (1998) refer to this intentional undermining as *knowledge destruction*. Techniques of knowledge destruction are characterized by the seeming sophistication of argument in using scientific principles to negate scientific fact. Erstwhile, the use of such techniques belays the negative beliefs and attitudes on the part of these commentators. A careful reading of what

is known about successful programmes is paramount to successfully planned programme implementation.

In an excellent review of the lessons learned from the literature on successful programme implementation, Lisbeth Shore (1991) noted that the implementation of programmes is "shaped by powerful forces" that are not easily modified even by "new knowledge". Indeed, Shore's summary of factors necessary in successful implementation include the necessity of a climate that is "created by skilled, committed professionals respectful and trusting of the clients they serve .....*regardless* of the precepts, demands and boundaries set by professionalism and bureaucracies" (p. 258). The necessity of providing caring programmes, that are coherent and easy to use, providing continuity and circumventing the traditions of limiting professional and bureaucratic limitations were absolutely the prerogative of such effective programmes. Paul Gendreau (1996) of course would add that a senior advocate in an organization who is willing to champion the cause of such a programme is an essential ingredient as well.

'Powerful forces' as Shore calls them are certainly at work in the corrections fields when it comes to transferring knowledge to practice on a broad scale. Political beliefs that have shaped correctional practice have in many cases been antagonistic to the lessons learned from the literature on effective corrections. Deterrence, sanctions and punishment-based correctional practices and policies have been pre-eminent in the last two decades. This is despite what Palmer (1996) amongst others indicates has been a failure of such programmes to demonstrate reductions in offending. Yet, juxtaposed to this emphasis on

---

[1] The author is grateful for the guidance in developing these ideas on dissemination from Dr. Gary Bernfeld of St.Lawrence College, Kingston Ontario. The forthcoming book by Bernfeld, Farrington and Leschied (Eds.) includes contributions from some of the leading researchers in the area of programme implementation and dissemination. In addition, readers may find the forthcoming Compendiums on effective correctional practice, volumes 1, 2 and 3 produced through Correctional Services Canada (Larry Motiuk, Ed.) of interest.

punishment reflected in correctional policy has been the extraordinary growth in knowledge in the area of effective treatment. The following sections identify the necessary steps in taking evidence-based practice into applied settings.

B. The Necessity of a Knowledge-Based Approach

Cullen, *et.al.*(1998) cite data suggesting that there continues to be many both within and without the corrections profession who have failed to recognize the growing literature on effective treatment with offender populations. Despite this disappointing lack of awareness, the literature continues to grow, documenting not only progress in regards to the accumulation of evidence of effective interventions, but also the summaries from numerous meta-analyses that now speak to the *patterns* of effectiveness being documented *across* studies. Numerous researchers and practitioners now speak about the need for examining 'technology transfer'; the application of what research has suggested can be effective and translating that knowledge into routine correctional practice. This chapter will highlight the factors related to implementation of programmes that attempt to comply with the principles of effective service. Though few in number, there are now studies that report on evaluations that *monitor* the *implementation* of programmes at both the practitioner level - referred to as *treatment adherence* - and the broader programme, service and system level - referred to as *programme compliance*.

Coupled with the move to monitor and measure adherence, is the growing emphasis on *dissemination* of information regarding effective programmes. Training is pivotal, combining both the communication of programme findings along with the kinds of support and consultation required to insure the effective replication of those programmes. Some of the more well-articulated interventions such as Multisystemic Therapy (Henggeler, Schoenwald, Bourduin, Rowland and Cunningham, 1998) and the Teaching-Family Model (1990) are currently developing, along with field input and support, detailed practitioner and supervisor manuals that can assist successful dissemination, although it must be acknowledged that such higher level dissemination efforts that are also being evaluated are still relatively rare in the human services and corrections fields. There are signs however that this situation may be changing. Fixsen, Blase, Timbers and Wolf (1990) have reported on a fifteen year follow-up of an evaluation of programme dissemination with the Teaching-Family Model. This analysis includes an examination of the challenge in developing a means of transferring knowledge to practitioners.

C. General Considerations for Successful Implementation

As with any change strategy in human service, the complexities of factors that need to be addressed in promoting a shift in correctional practice may seem daunting if not absolutely overwhelming to an initiator of programme change. Ellickson and Petersilia (1983) identified six principle organizational considerations that were necessary in initiating programme implementation in corrections. They included:

- Sincere motivation at implementation
- Support at the top of leadership and each group whose cooperation is required for implementation and use
- Staff competence
- A cost-benefit surplus
- Clarity of goals and procedures
- Clear lines of authority

In addition, programme shifts for implementation in corrections requires the support of both legal and non-legal stakeholders in the community. What may make sense from a programme perspective may be seen by the courts as in conflict with the rule of law. For example, if justice is seen as too individualized i.e. sanctions are not seen as proportionate given the nature of the offending, the rule of law may be perceived as under-mined because of the inequity of the severity and nature of the sanction. Clarity in the purpose and role of the courts and other law-related forums need to be seen as complementary to the role and purpose of correctional programmes.

D. Contextual Issues in Successful Implementation

Experience in North America over the past two decades has reflected the trend towards incarceration as the correctional policy of choice. Trends in the support for incarceration coupled with the legacy of the nothing works conclusions of reviewers of correctional programmes in the early and mid 1970's, created considerable challenge to implement programmes that were not predicated simply on adding to the incarceration rate. In many respects, findings from programme reviews suggesting that the community was the preferred context in which to deliver effective programmes flew in the face of the *get tough* school of corrections policy. Hence, development of trends such as intensive probation supervision programmes, even though evidence suggested their abilities to influence offending rates, were tough sells. There are two important factors to be considered. The first is to have an awareness of the extant literature on effective practice; to be aware of what is possible in delivering a successful programme, and to not oversell the effects

of even successful programmes. While the general outcome literature is now reporting reductions in offending ranging from 20 to 40 per cent (Andrews et. al. (1990); Lipsey and Wilson, 1998) there are some areas of correctional practice where data has not supported claims of effectiveness. One such area is related to outcomes with psychopathic individuals.

The second critical consideration in promoting programme implementation is knowledge of the willingness, level of acceptance of policy makers, correctional professionals and the immediate community to accept a shift in policy. Petersilia as cited in Harris and Smith (1996) suggests,

> *"Unless a community recognizes or accepts the premise that a change in corrections is needed, is affordable, and does not conflict with its sentiments regarding just punishment, an innovative project has little hope of surviving much less succeeding".*

While there seems some minor variations in interpretation of the effects of the immediate context to support implementation of programmes, as a general statement, community contexts seem more able to support effective outcomes when compared to programmes delivered in residential contexts (Andrews and Bonta, 1998). Henggeler and his colleagues argue that treating high risk youth in the community is a more ecologically valid approach to both assessing and treating high risk youth since it allows for an increased opportunity to work directly with the systems that are both influencing and being influenced by the behaviour of their families and peers. Hoge, Leschied and Andrews (1993) in a study on the components in young offender

programmes found that factors in agreement with items related to effective correctional practice were more likely to be identified in community programmes than in residential programmes.

E. Empirical Findings Related to Implementation: Treatment Adherence and Programme Compliance

The evolution of research development in the corrections field has only recently emphasized the importance of providing outcome evaluation as a standard in service delivery. It may come as a surprise to some that, as reported in Andrews et. al., programmes that were being evaluated *by those charged with their implementation* were actually characterized in their outcomes as more effective than those that were not being as closely monitored. Hence it would seem that evaluation could also be characterized as a factor in successful implementation. Monitoring for programme implementation however has not met with the same level of development. This section will highlight two examples of implementation evaluation which serve to assist in understanding programmes that are relatively successful in identifying effective implementation strategies.

1. Treatment Adherence

For any experienced corrections professional, it will come as no surprise that implementation, while critical, is only a part of any success story. The real challenge arises in trying to, 1) implement a programme consistent with the components reflecting an effective strategy- referred to as programme integrity and, 2) support those factors that can sustain a programme after it has shown itself to be effective.

What are those factors that influence sustainability and help programmes remain true to those factors critical to successful?

Multi-Systemic Therapy: Scott Henggeler and his associates at the Medical University of South Carolina have turned their attention not only to programme contents that are effective with high risk youth, but also to those factors that can sustain an effective programme over the longer term.

A brief overview of MST suggests that a therapeutic focus on certain systemic factors within the lives of highly conflicted youth, (i.e. that share a present, solution, strength-based focus) will be rewarded with significant reductions in youth criminal activity. Results from Henggeler, Melton, Brondino, Scherer and Hanley (1997) suggested that while some treatment gains were sustained in some youths, others were not. Further analysis by the authors suggested that programme sustainability was tied to the presence of certain therapist/programme characteristics that in turn characterized specific components of the MST model. The conclusion of this study suggested that to achieve sustainability of positive outcomes from intervention, adequate and on-going training and consultation was necessary. Further, these authors developed the Therapist Adherence Measure (TAM) which consists of 26 items that ask family members to rate their therapist on items that would reflect consistency of the intervention with the principles of MST. Computer scoring with the TAM allows for a relatively short turn around time to provide a quantified summary to the therapist and their supervisor regarding how consistent the intervention was provided on a case by case basis. Data suggests that therapist adherence is positively correlated with client

outcomes. The development of similar adherence measures particular to a given intervention is possible given clearly identified and well articulated aspects of the nature of the intervention and type of service delivery.

2. Programme Compliance

While studies such as with MST examine treatment adherence at the therapist level, another line of investigation recommends evaluating a programme's ability to comply with pre-set conditions that *evidence has suggested* are consistent with overall components of effective programmes.

The Correctional Programme Assessment Inventory: The CPAI (Gendreau and Andrews, 1996) is an inventory developed out of the meta-analysis literature on effective programmes. It consists of seventy-five items covering six components critical to the understanding of what constitutes an effective programme, along with two areas that are considered integral to effective programmes, namely emphasis on evaluation and ethical considerations. The components consist of: programme implementation, client pre-service assessment, programme characteristics, staff characteristics, evaluation and other (i.e. ethical consideration). All of the components and the questions asked of programmes consist of factors influenced by the reviews of the effective corrections literature. Table 2 summarizes the six components of the CPAI.

Table 2
Summary of the CPAI Components

Scale	Scale Description
1. Programme Implementation	Surveys the conditions under which the programme was introduced
2. Preservice Assessment	Surveys applications of the principle of risk, need and responsivity
3. Programme Characteristics	Assesses targeting of criminogenic factors and the use of cognitive behavioural techniques
4. Therapeutic Integrity	Surveys service delivery, emphasising intensity and matching conditions
5. Relapse Prevention	Surveys extent to which programmes focus on post-release programmes
6. Staff Characteristics	Surveys staff and training issues
7. Evaluation	Examines the extent to which the system emphasizes/encourages research and evaluation activities
8. Other	Assesses emphasis on ethical concerns and security of programme funding

In a relatively large scale review of young offender programmes in one jurisdiction, Hoge, Leschied and Andrews (1993) reviewed over one hundred programmes measured on the extent and nature of their components on the CPAI. The results of this study were telling. Data reflected the range of programme components that were available. Table 2 summarizes the scale scores of the CPAI

as a function of the location of the programmes (i.e. custody, probation) Scores on the important scales from the CPAI tended to be in the community (characterized as Community Support Teams) opposed to custody. Further analysis using a measure such as the CPAI can identify training and staff needs, movement of service from residential to community and approaches in capitalizing on the strengths of certain programmes. While the authors would defer that measures such as the CPAI should not be held as a 'gold standard', nonetheless, such a measure holds promise in assessing programmes on a broad scale.

F. Issues in Dissemination and Training

As programmes generally, and correctional programmes in particular move to higher levels of accountability, the movement towards standards of practice and compliance reviews will be encouraged. Indeed, in the next two years, Correctional Services Canada with the support of the Home Office in the United Kingdom will be moving towards adopting a set of standards to guide the content and delivery of programmes. The increasing challenge therefore will be to move the developing knowledge to the field in order to implement effective correctional practices.

Access to that knowledge is an on-going challenge, both to those who are partners in developing it, and also to those practitioners who are trying to access it. The tradition of developing knowledge, only to have it published in relatively obscure academic journals read by few will, arguably, not move the field dramatically in developing innovative strategies. Indeed, this tradition of distancing knowledge from the field in viewing publication as the end of

knowledge development rather than the beginning, may be an answer to Cullen et.al.'s query as to why so many in the correction's field lack familiarity with knowledge in the area of effective corrections. A major challenge in corrections therefore will be to look to innovative ways to communicate what is known in order to support change at the policy and practitioner level. Increasing the availability of knowledge is perhaps the single largest challenge in this area. Four innovations in communication in corrections are worth note as examples.

1. RCJNet is a list serve website that communicates to numerous corrections processionals about knowledge in the corrections field. Currently managed by Irving Kulik of CSC, the service provides website links, summaries of recent justice documents, or summaries of research that may be of interest. Using latest technology, RCJNet serves as a clearinghouse for current corrections information. The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) out of Washington D.C. serves a similar purpose in the U.S. in making current documents available on line for wide spread dissemination.

2. The National Institute of Justice (NIJ) has initiated a distance education programme providing learning opportunities to correctional professionals through a system of centres connected through satellite-linked communications systems. From a single source, unlimited numbers of practitioners and policy makers across a limitless geographic area can interact with the leaders in the field in hearing of new programme or policy ideas.

3. The London Family Court Clinic, along with Multi-Systemic Therapy Services Incorporated in Charleston,

South Carolina has developed an interactive website that links MST teams across North America and Europe. Practitioners using MST are able to communicate with one another with respect to promising therapeutic approaches or clinical issues that may arise in the course of service delivery. Recently, the development of an MST clinical team in Norway was able to link to the Ontario teams. Collegial supervision takes on new meaning in this era of expanding technology!

4. The Toronto-Based Institute for Anti-Social and Violent Youth (IAVY) directed by Jalal Shamsie has, for close to twenty-five years, provided an extracting and commentary service on articles of particular interest to the young offender field. Such services help to focus and summarize information of particular currency and relevance to the field by reviewing articles from major journals.

G. Summary and Conclusion

Implementation of programmes in as politically-charged context as corrections finds itself is a challenging prospect. What corrections professionals have going for them however is a knowledge base that supports certain programmes and policies over others with the goal towards increasing community safety and lessening human misery. This chapter has highlighted the major issues in implementation as being:

- An acknowledgement of the literature on what works for effective corrections and policy practices. This literature highlights appropriate assessment strategies that increase the potential for interventions to be clinically relevant to factors that influence criminogenic risk.

- Identification of contextual factors that can influence the probability that programme innovation will be successfully introduced. These factors include leadership support for implementation, staff competence and goal clarification for the reasons behind implementation. It is suggested that a multi-level systems analysis is necessary to fully comprehend the complexities of systems change. The four levels of analysis should include an understanding of the needs of the client, programme, agency, and society.

- Specific contextual factors influence successful implementation. Current knowledge suggests that different factors influence successful *community-based* implementation versus *residential-based* implementation.

- Measures have been developed to monitor the degree of success in programme implementation. These include measures for both treatment adherence and programme compliance. Finally, training and dissemination is now considered the greatest challenge facing implementation in the corrections field. The nothing works debate is now recognized as serving an important purpose in focussing efforts in developing the current extent of knowledge on effective practice. However, as many have cited, the nothing works debate is now over. Arguably what could shape the next generation of corrections professionals is the challenge of communicating the knowledge on effective strategies to practitioners. Using current technology, clearinghouse extracting services, the internet and interactive communication technology are all examples of methods in communicating that knowledge to those who make decisions both for policy and for practice.

References

Andrews, D.A., A.W. Leschied and R.D. Hoge. A review of the profile, prediction and treatment literature with young offenders: A social psychological approach, Toronto: Ministry of Community and Social Services, 1992.

Andrews, D.A., Zinger, I., Hoge, R.D., Bonta, J., Gendreau, P. & Cullen, F. (1990). Does correctional treatment work? A clinically-relevant and psychologically-informed metanalysis. *Criminology*, 28, 369-404.

Andrews, D.A. and Bonta, J.(1998). *The psychology of criminal conduct*. (Second Edition) Anderson Publishing, Cincinnati, OH.

Bauman, L.J., Bauman, Stein, R.E.K. & Reys, H.T. (1991). Reinventing fidelity: The transfer of social technology among settings. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 19, 619-639.

Cullen, F.T., Wright, J.P., Brown, S., Moon, M.M., Blankenship, M.B. & Applegate, B.K. (1998). Attitudes toward prevention. *Crime and Delinquency*, 2, 187-204.

Department of Justice Canada. *A Strategy for the Renewal of Youth Justice*, Ottawa: Department of Justice Canada, 1998.

Ellickson, P. & Petersilia, J.(1983). *Implementing new ideas in criminal justice*. Santa Monica CA: The Rand Corporation.

Fixsen, D.L., Olivier, K.A., & Blase, D.A. (1990). Home-based, family centred treatment for children. Unpublished manuscript. Hull Child & Family Services.

Gendreau, P. and Andrews, D.A. (1996). *Correctional Programme Assessment Inventory*. University of New Brunswick, St. John NB.

Gendreau, P. and C. Goggin. Correctional Treatment: Accomplishments and Realities. In P. VanVoorhis, M. Braswell and D. Lester (Eds.), *Correctional Counselling*, 3rd Edition, Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing Co., pp. 271-280, 1997.

Gendreau, P. and Ross, R.R. (1979). Effective correctional treatment: Bibliotherapy for cynics. Crime and Delinquency, 21, 463-489.

Hare, R. (1991). *The Hare Psychopathy Checklist-Revised*. Toronto, ON. Multi Health Systems.

Harris, P. & Smith, S. (1996). Developing community corrections: An Implementation perspective. In A.T. Harland (ed.) *Choosing correctional options that work: Defining the demand and evaluating the supply*. Thousand Oaks, CA. Sage Publ. Pps. 183-222.

Henggeler, S., Schoenwald, S.K., Bourduin, C.M., Rowland, M.D. & Cunningham, P.B. (1998) *Multisystemic treatment of antisocial behaviour in children and adolescents*. The Guildford Press, New York, NY.

Henggeler, S.W., Melton, G.B., Brondino, M.J., Scherer, D.G. & Hanley, J.H. (1997). Multisystemic therapy with violent and chronic juvenile offenders and their families: The role of treatment fidelity and successful dissemination. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 5, 821-833.

Hoge, R.D., Leschied, A.W. & Andrews, D.A. (1993). *An investigation of young*

offender services in the province of Ontario: A report of the repeat offender project. Ministry of Community and Social Services, Toronto, ON.

Hoge, R.D., Andrews, D.A. & Leschied, A.W. (1995). *The Risk/Need Inventory*. The Ministry of Community and Social Services, Toronto, ON.

Huizinga, D.H., Menard, S. & Elliott, D.S. (1989). Delinquency and drug use: Temporal and developmental patterns. *Justice Quarterly*, 6,3, 419-455.

Kazdin, A.E. & Weisz, J.R. (1998). Identifying and developing empirically supported child and adolescent treatments. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 66,1, 19-36

Leschied, A. W., & Gendreau, P. (1986). The declining role of rehabilitation in Canadian juvenile justice: Implications of underlying theory in the Young Offenders Act. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 28, 315-322. Also in T. O'Reilly-Fleming & B. Clark (Eds.) (1993), *Youth injustice: Canadian perspectives* (pp. 39-47). Toronto, ON: Canadian Scholars' Press Inc.

Leschied, A. W., & Jaffe, P. G. (1986). Implications of the consent to treatment section of the Young Offenders Act: A case study. *Canadian Psychology*, 27, 312-313.

Leschied, A. W., & Gendreau, P. (1986). The declining role of rehabilitation in Canadian juvenile justice: Implications of underlying theory in the Young Offenders Act. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 28, 315-322. Also in T. O'Reilly-Fleming & B. Clark (Eds.) (1993), *Youth injustice: Canadian perspectives* (pp. 39-47). Toronto, ON: Canadian Scholars' Press Inc.

Leschied, A.W. and Cunningham, A. (1999) Clinical trials of Multisystemic therapy in Ontario: Rationale and current status of a community-based alternative for high risk young offenders. *Forum on Corrections Research*, 11, 25-30.

Lipsey, M. (1995). What do we learn from 400 research studies on the effectiveness of treatment with juvenile delinquents. In J. MacGuire (ed.) *What Works: Reducing Offending*. John and Wiley and Sons, Chichester, UK. pps. 63-78.

Lipsey, M.W. and Wilson, D.B. (1998). Effective interventions for serious juvenile offenders: A syntheses of research. In R. Loeber and D.P. Farrington (eds.) *Serious and violent offenders: Risk factors and successful interventions*. Thousand Oaks, CA. Sage Publ. pps. 313-366.

Losel, F. (1998). Treatment and management of psychopaths. In D.J. Cooke, A. Forth & R.B. Hare (eds.) *Psychopathy: Theory, Research and Implications for Society*. The Hague: Kluwer Academic Publishers, pps. 303-354.

Martinson, R. (1979). What works: Questions and answers about prison reform. *The Public Interest*, 35, 22-54.

Palmer,T.1996).Programmatic and Nonprogrammatic aspects of successful implementation. In A.T. Harland (ed.) *Choosing correctional options that work: Defining the demand and evaluating the supply*. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA. pps. 131-182.

Shamsie, J. (1979). Our treatments do not work, where do we go from here? *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*.

Shore, L.B. (1991). Successful programmes: From moving models to moving mountains. Presented to the "Empowering Families" Conference. St. Louis, Missouri. December, 7.

Simourd, D. & Van de Ven, J. (1999). Assessment of criminal attitudes: Criterion-related validity of the criminal sentiments scale-modified and pride in delinquency scale. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*, 1, 90-106.

Wells, L.E. (1991). *The utility of meta-analysis in criminal justice research*. Paper presented at the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences Meetings, Nashville, TN.