4/83

REVIEW OF TRAINING PROGRAMS

AT A YOUTH TRAINING CENTRE

Report for the Australian Criminology Research Council,
Canberra

Submitted by : Robert Arthur Semmens
B.A.Dip.Crim., Dip.Soc.Studs., M.Ed.,
Head of Special Education Department
Melbourne College of Advanced Education
757 Swanston Street
Carlton, Vic., 3053.

May, 1986

CONTENTS

CHAPTER 2 ANALYSIS OF DATA

APPENDICES

SUMMARY OF THESIS

This study investigates the effectiveness of school and work training programs in a youth training centre as means for achievement of a community re-integration goal. Both literature on the transformation of the world of work and research evidence on impediments to low status youth gaining high status credentials suggest that curriculum aims at a youth training centre need to address the social and economic climate of our times to facilitate community reintegration of training program participants.

Evaluation of school and work training programs at Malmsbury youth training centre finds no significant differences between school and work program groups on the community re-integration criteria of employment and recidivism six months after release.

However, it is found that three significantly different groups of youths emerge when data is analysed according to institutional history and previous schooling. These groups are called State Ward, Young Offender, and Adult Offender. State Wards have the longest and Adult Offenders have the shortest institutional history.

At school, the 27 Adult Offenders all stayed beyond Year 9, whereas

none of the 29 Young Offenders and only 6 of the 32 State Wards stayed beyond Year 9. While State Wards aspire to significantly more schooling, their perceptions of previous schooling are significantly more negative than the other two groups.

There is no significant difference between the groups on employment status either before or after detention. However, the three groups were significantly different in the number of weeks worked in the follow-up period, with the Adult Offenders working most and the State Wards least.

The study suggests that general education theory may not be adequate in raising expectations for these youth and proposes curriculum aims based on multi-disciplinary sources. Application of these aims would connect program participants to higher status employment and satisfy other criteria for community re-integration.

INTRODUCTION

The central issue addressed by this research is whether school and work training programs in a correctional youth training centre can increase employment and reduce offending of the participants. This issue has been selected for study because youth training centres operating in Victoria since the early 1960's have largely relied on school and work programs to achieve re-integration of the young person into the community. While counselling is also provided for personal problem resolution, this serves as a supplement to the training emphasis for particular youths who have alcohol related offences, family conflict, or psychiatric diagnoses.

Yet, given their implementation, youth training centre programs in Victoria have never been evaluated in terms of their community re-integration goal. One recidivism study, carried out by the Department for Community Services (1983), recorded a re-offending rate of 43.7% for a random sample of 87 males and females aged 15 - 21, six months after release. This study did not, however, test for any relationship between training programs and re-offending rates. This lack of established connection between training programs and outcomes raises questions about the extent to which program outcomes may reflect factors other than the quality of the training programs. For example, the extent to which previous school and institutional experiences may influence program participation warrants

attention. Questions can also be asked about post-release variables, such as employment opportunities. Analysis of pre and post training program experiences could refine the notion of community re-integration and, concomittantly, point to alternative curriculum aims for a youth training centre.

Malmsbury Youth Training Centre

The youth training centre located 100 km north of Melbourne in the small town of Malmsbury in the centre of a mixed farming area is appropriate for this study. Malmsbury youth training centre offers school and work training programs in which all inmates participate for the duration of their sentence, which can be up to thirteen months before parole.

The youth training centre was established by the State Department of Community Services in 1964 as an alternative to imprisonment for 17-21 year old male offenders. The youth training centre disposition enables adult courts to sentence young offenders according to Clause 476A of the Victorian Crimes Act (1958) which states:

> Whenever imprisonment may by law be awarded for any indictable offence and the offender is a person under the age of twenty-one years at the date of his conviction, the Court may, having regard to the nature of the offence and to the age character and antecedents of the offender, in lieu of any sentence of imprisonment direct that the offender be detained in a youth training centre for a period of not more than three years:
>
> Provided that where the offender has been convicted in the same proceedings of more than one such offence the Court may direct that he be detained for an aggregate period of not more than three years in respect of all such offences.

There is one other 'adult' male youth training centre in Victoria, called 'Langi Kal Kal', which is located 150 km west of Melbourne, near the provincial city of Ballarat. Thus the distance from Melbourne was the deciding factor in preferring the Malmsbury youth training centre as the site for this evaluation study. There is also one youth training centre for 'adult' females (Winlaton) in an eastern suburb of Melbourne, and none in any other State of Australia. Winlaton caters for 14 - 17 year old girls as well as the 17-21 age group but numbers are not sufficient in either age group for the purposes of this research study. There is an equivalent youth training centre for 14-17 year old boys (Turana) near the centre of Melbourne but it is divided into sections according to security ratings and the movement from one section to another or to other institutions would complicate the evaluation process. Turana has no training responsibility for 17-21 year olds, but has a holding responsibility only for that age group during transit from prison to Malmsbury and Langi Kal Kal or vice versa. Selection of a prison setting for the evaluation study would be complicated by negotiations around access and security. Additionally, not all prisoners engage in training programs, and those who do may be involved for widely varying periods of time, due to length of sentence or transfer to another prison.

In summary, the main advantages of undertaking an evaluation study at Malmsbury are : its accessible location, its low security, its training emphasis, and the homogeneity of sentence duration and age group.

The number of youths in residence is also an attractive factor for research purposes. The Malmsbury youth training centre caters for 60 - 70 youths in residence at any one time. It is possible for youths to gain weekend leave about once per month according to behaviour and availability of approved accommodation with relatives or interested adults. Special leave is also available for attendance at short courses or for special family reasons.

There are two types of training program offered at the Malmsbury Youth Training centre - school and work. Youths can select which program they go into, although this sometimes means waiting until there is a vacancy. School programs are staffed by Education Department teachers with qualifications in special education. The courses range from remedial literacy and numeracy to higher secondary level and other specialist courses by correspondence from educational institutions throughout the State, and possibly interstate.

Work programs are staffed by Department for Community Services trade instructors and work supervisors. The trade groups engage in maintenance work around the youth training centre and the surrounding community, and include bricklaying, motor mechanics, welding, building construction, painting and gardening. Work supervision is conducted in the kitchen, laundry, and boiler-room.

The Sample

All youths admitted to Malmsbury youth training centre between April 1st, 1983, and April 30th, 1984 were invited to participate in the evaluation study. Five youths refused and a further six youths were excluded because their sentence was less than four months.

This left 165 youths for participation in the study. A further 52 youths did not complete their training program due to escape (32), transfer (10), successful appeal (4) and early release (6), leaving 113 youths who completed their training program. Of these, 57 completed school programs and 56 completed work programs. Six months after release 88 of the 113 youths were traced, 45 having completed school programs and 43 having completed work programs.

Categorisation within sample.

For evaluation of the training programs in accordance with the requirements of research question 1, which addresses the relationship between training program experience and possible employment and recidivism outcomes, the youths are categorised into school (45) or work (43) as detailed above.

For the purposes of research question 2, which addresses the relationship between previous institutional and schooling experience and possible employment and recidivism outcomes, the youths are categorised according to commonalities in previous institutional and schooling experience. The basis for this grouping is age at first institutionalisation and level of schooling reached, because these criteria are unambiguous. The cut-off points for "institutional" groupings corresponds with legally defined categories in Victoria. These are 'State Ward', i.e. first institutionalised before his fifteenth birthday; 'Young Offender', i.e. first institutionalised after his fifteenth birthday but before his seventeenth birthday; and 'Adult Offender', i.e. first institutionalised after his seventeenth birthday by a court of adult jurisdiction. The offender categorisation precedes schooling level categorisation because the primary focus of the research is upon the effectiveness of training programs on participant offender categories, and then secondly on implications for schooling generally. Another reason for offender categories

preceding allocation of youths according to school level reached is that for State Wards, at least, institutionalisation precedes the legal school leaving age.

In addition to this categorisation of youths for the purpose of analysing possible relationships between previous institutionalisation and/or schooling and the offences for which the youth was sentenced to Malmsbury, a trouble index was developed to provide a score which combines number of offences, seriousness of offences, and length of sentence. These scores should indicate whether there are significant differences in offending behaviour between State Wards, Young Offenders, and Adult Offenders, and if such differences exist, whether they are related to level of schooling reached.

Attrition of Sample

A greater number of State Wards escaped or were transferred to detention elsewhere. Proportionally too, it can be seen from Table 1 that the State Ward group are over represented in that, of the original sample of 165 youths, 70 were State Wards, 52 were Young Offenders, and 43 were Adult Offenders. Nineteen State Ward escapes therefore represents 11.5% of the total sample or 28.8% of the State Ward group. The 10 Young Offender escapes represent 6% of the total sample or 18.2% of the Young Offender group. Three Adult Offender escapes represent

1.8% of the total sample or 6.8% of the Adult Offender group. It is not known how many escapees received prison sentences but none of the above cases returned to Malmsbury youth training centre if they were apprehended.

The "transfers" also appear more likely to occur for the State Ward group, whereas successful appeals appear more likely to occur for the Adult Offenders group. However, the numbers are too small to indicate strong trends. The "early release" youths were released shortly before their official date for release in order to take advantage of employment arrangements.

TABLE 1

During-Program Attrition of Sample

	State Ward	Young Offender	Adult Offender
Escape	19	10	3
Prison Transfer	5	1	1
Y.T.C. Transfer	3	1	0
Early Release	0	3	2
Successful Appeal	0	0	4

Between release and the follow-up questionnaire six months later a further 25 youths had to be deleted from the sample due to change of address or failure to respond to telephone and written requests to complete the questionnaire. Twelve were State Wards, eight were Young Offenders and five were Adult Offenders. This left 45 former school program participants and 43 former work program participants, making a total of 88 youths who completed all three stages of the research study - 32 State Wards, 29 Young Offenders, and 27 Adult Offenders.

The numbers of participants at each stage of the research study may be found in Table 2. It will be seen that program-wise the final sample proportions in school and work programs at each stage remain close to 50%. However, it may be seen from Table 3 that the offender group proportions vary at each stage. The proportion of State Ward participants reduces from 42.4% to 35.3% while the other two groups increase with the Adult Offenders increasing by 5.7% from 26.1% to 31.8%. It is not known what impact these changes in proportions have on the outcome of the research study but it is noted as a possible source of bias.

TABLE 2

Attrition of Sample According to Training Program

Data Collection Stage	School	Work	Totals
1. Pre-progam	80	85	165
2. Post-program	57	56	113
3 Follow-up	45	43	88

TABLE 3

Attrition of Sample According to Offender Group.

Data Collection Stage	State Ward	Young Offender	Adult Offender	Totals
1.Pre-Program	70	52	43	165
2.Post-Program	43	37	33	113
3.Follow-up	32	29	27	88

CHAPTER 1

RESEARCH METHOD

1.0 Research Design

.1 Research Question One

The first question for study explores the relationship between training program experience and employment and recidivism outcomes. Several measurement instruments were developed for training program evaluation. Firstly, a 'social awareness' interview was developed to evaluate the extent to which curriculum content of training programs, and of previous schooling, is concerned with teaching about the world of work, democratic decision-making, cultural connection, and social relationships.

The second instrument, developed for program evaluation is called an alienation scale and was administered before and after program participation to establish whether youths felt more or less alienated by their training program participation. The alienation scale is a curriculum process, rather than curriculum content, instrument of measurement.

For evaluation of the relative impact of school or work program participation on employment, the number of weeks employed and the prestige ranking of employment were calculated for the six months before and the six months after program participation.

In relation to recidivism, the relative percentages of re-offending, according to type of program (school or work) were compared.

1.2 Research Question Two

The second question for study explores the relationship between previous institutional and schooling experiences and post release employment and recidivism outcomes. In order to explore this question youths were grouped according to previous institutionalisation and schooling. The groups were called 'State Ward', 'Young Offender' and 'Adult Offender'.

Youths were also interviewed about their schooling expectations and aspirations, and requested to rate their degree of involvement in previous schooling.

Social awareness and alienation scale data were compared according to offender grouping. For evaluation of the relative impact of training program participation on offender grouping, the number of weeks and prestige ranking of employment were compared for the six mnonths before and after program participation.

Recidivism was measured in terms of significance of differences between re-offending rates of the offender groups.

1.3 Research Question Three

The third question for study explores the possibility of designing youth training centre programs that are more effective at achieving community re-integration. The conclusions of the first two questions inform the response to this question. Significant differences between school and work program outcomes would be interpreted as support for the existing curriculum aims and strategies adopted by the more effective program. However, these curriculum aims and strategies would also be placed into a context of curriculum theory to facilitate replication.

On the other hand lack of significant differences between school and work program outcomes, would lead to development of alternative curriculum aims for more effective outcomes evolving out of a preferred theoretical model. Similarily, if no significant differences between offender group outcomes are found (Research Question Two), an alternative theoretical model for program development, will be selected.

However, if it is found that there are significant differences between offender group outcomes, there could be implications for curriculum aims and strategies for both youth training centre and mainstream schooling. These implications would relate to alienating curriculum content and process of schooling. Exploration of this 'causal' issue will be further assisted by use of another

measurement instrument called a 'trouble index'. The trouble index combines number of offences with seriousness of offence and length of sentence, and will assist in determining whether length of institutional history is related to qualitative differences in offending behaviour.

To summarise, the research design for exploring the three research questions is presented diagrammatically in Figure 1. This is followed by detail of the research instruments.

Data Collection Point	Research Instrument	Research Question 1	2	3
Pre-program	Trouble Index.			x
	Previous institutionalis/n		x	x
	Interview: Previous schooling		x	x
Last 6 mths' employment		x	x	x
	Alienation scale	x	x	x
Post-program	Interview: training program participation.	x	x	x
	Social awareness interview.	x	x	x
	Alienation scale.	x	x	x
Six-month follow-up	Post-release employment.	x	x	x
	Post-release offences.	x	x	x

FIGURE 1
Summary of Research Plan

Instruments

.1 Pre-program Interview

The interview seeks data about the level of schooling reached, and the nature of employment over the 26 weeks preceding detention. There are also questions relating to current expectations and aspirations in relation to further training. These data were used in a comparative way i.e. to compare differences in actual schooling level with level expected and with level of aspiration.

There are three further questions relating to school involvement of self and peers, to perception of school as a place to be, and to school as preparation for life outside of school. These questions were asked at the end of the social awareness interview because they extended the social relationships sequence of questions on that interview. However, these additional questions were not scored as part of the scoring system of the social awareness interview.

A copy of the pre-program interview is appendixed - see Appendix No.1.

2.2 Post-Program Interview

This interview seeks quantifiable data for tabulation of program participation whilst at Malmsbury and future training and work expectations and aspirations.

Similar questions about involvements in the life of the institution and its perceived preparation for life outside are asked as an extension of the social relationships section of the social awareness interview, as for the pre-program interview.

A copy of the post-program interview is appendixed - see Appendix No. 2.

2.3 Social Awareness Interview

The interview is called 'social awareness interview' because it aims to establish whether curriculumn content at school and at Malmsbury included teaching in the identified areas of curriculum concern for youth outlined in chapter one of this thesis. These areas are:

1. transition to work.
2. participation in the democratic process.
3. cultural connection.
4. competence in human relationships.

Additionally, the interview aims to establish whether the methods used in teaching the curriculum content, provide evidence of a school's attempts to organise in ways that include, rather than exclude students in its curriculum

content and process. The interview therefore samples knowledge areas and the methods by which those knowledge areas were taught.

Some additional questions are contained in the interview. These questions relate to the social context of the school and the student's perception of himself in that context. These questions are directed at the extent to which the youth felt that he belonged to the school community.

Face validity for the 'social awareness' areas of the interview derives from the curriculum issues outlined in chapter one. Further, a comparision study using the social awareness interview, was carried out with 150 school children from 11 post-primary school across Victoria. This study is reported in Appendix No.4. The social awareness interview itself is Appendix No.3. Notes on the administration and scoring of the interview are also included in Appendix No.3.

2..4 Alienation Scale

The alienation scale aims to measure attitudes and beliefs about self and others from which it might be deduced from scale norms that the individual feels relatively more or relatively less committed to conventional society.

By administering the scale before and after program participation at Malmsbury change scores could be computed

for significance. The areas selected for the scale were initially the same as for the social awareness interview because of a possible relationship between schooling and a sense of alienation (Polk, 1969; Pink, 1978, 1982).

Items that could ultimately yield an 'alienation' scale were collected in four areas, as follows:

1. transition to work.
2. participation in the democratic process.
3. cultural connection.
4. competence in human relationships.

A 60-item scale was trialled with 59 youth training centre and 52 non-youth training centre students. The scale was gradually reduced through factor analysis to 33 items with three sub-scales which were called:

motivation for work.
social tolerance.
personal adequacy.

These three sub-scales approximated to three of the originally proposed sub-scales but there was no approximation to the proposed sub-scale for "participation in the democratic process". Further refinement of some of these items in the future may enable them to be re-trialled and included in the alienation scale.

A copy of the alienation scale and the procedures for its

development are appendixed - See Appendix No.5

.5 Measures of Employment

Data on employment status and the number of weeks worked were collected pre and post Malmsbury training programs, ikn the following ways:

.5.1 Employment Status

The status rankings of jobs held in the 26 weeks pre and post Malmsbury training programs were compared using the ranking scale developed by Daniel (1983), Appendix 6. Where a youth worked more than one job and the jobs were of different status rankings, the highest ranking job was recorded for data analysis purposes.

Three jobs obtained by Malmsbury youths were not listed on the Daniel scale. These jobs (signwriter, gardener assistant, and fishing boat hand) were ranked by five colleagues of the researcher and then the researcher averaged the ranking for each job and inserted them against that number on the Daniel scale so that those jobs could be included in the analysis of data. A copy of the Daniel Scale appears as Appendix No.6.

.5.2 Number of Weeks Employed

The number of weeks employed out of the 26 weeks just prior to detention and the 26 weeks immediately after release were compared for each youth, for the whole group, for sub-groups based on previous institutionalisation (State Ward, Youth Offender, Adult Offender), and for sub-groups based on program participation (school, work).

.6 Trouble Index

The trouble index combines number of offences with seriousness of offence and length of disposition and provides a way of summarising data about the offences in the six months prior to detention and the six months post release.

The trouble index derives from the trouble index devised from the Marion County Youth Study (Polk, 1982) and applied according to Australian legal terminology.

A copy of the trouble index is contained in Appendix No.7.

2.7 Follow-up Questionnaire

Six months after release data were collected on further training, employment and offending recorded during that period. The youths were traced as far as possible and requested to provide answers, by telephone, in writing, or through personal interview. Offence data were also collected from police and prison records.

The follow-up questionnaire invited youths to include suggestions for improvements in training programs at Malmsbury.

A copy of the follow-up questionnaire is appendixed - See Appendix No.8

3.0 Procedure

The research proceded as follows:

Stage 1.

The pre-program interview was administered within the first week of detention at Malmsbury.

Previous school and work data were collected from youths and files.

The social awareness interview and the alienation scale were administered at the same session as the pre-program interview.

Offence history was obtained from Malmsbury youth-training centre files.

Stage 2.

The post-program interview was administered during the last possible week of detention at Malmsbury taking into account parole and release arrangements in each case.

The social awareness interview and the alienation scale were re-administered at the same time as the post-program interview.

Stage 3.

The follow-up questionnaire was completed with each available youth six months after release from Malmsbury.

A detailed account of the research procedure is presented below.

One day each week for 13 months (April 1983 - 1984) was spent in interviewing newly admitted youths at Malmsbury Youth Training centre. Each youth with a sentence of more than four months was invited to participate in the research project. Short sentence youths were excluded on the grounds that a minimum period of four months between administrations of the alienation scale was necessary to avoid possible contamination of responses.

Each youth was given an outline of the research proposal and invited to sign an agreement to participate, including permission

for the researcher to peruse Community Services Department files and police files. Permission for access to files was also gained from the relevant State Government Ministers. 165 youths agreed to participate and six refused.

Following agreement to participate each youth completed the pre-program interview relating to school and work history and then continued straight on to the social awareness interview and the alienation scale. This entire set of procedures took 40–50 minutes for each youth.

Most weeks there were at least three new youths for interview and sometimes 5 or 6. The interviews took place in the "Intake Section" of the youth training centre where recently arrived youths are accommodated for approximately one week before commencement of their training program.

The researcher recorded summary data on a separate card for each youth. This included name, age, address, length of sentence, previous institutionalisation, level of schooling reached, previous employment data, scores on social awareness and alienation, trouble index, and chosen training program.

While the pre-program interviews continued for 13 months, post-program interviewing commenced after the first four months and continued for eight months after the pre-program interview stage was complete.

The post-program interviews were conducted wherever the youths

could be located - in the school office, in offices of work training venues, or in the offices of the various living units (sections) at the youth training centre.

The post-program interview required data about program participation, and re-administration of the social awareness interview and the alienation scale.

Upon completion of these post-program procedures each youth was reminded of the six-month follow-up questionnaire and the payment of $10.00 at that time. This money was provided by the Criminology Research Council.

Six months after release each youth was sent a letter encouraging him to complete the enclosed questionnaire and to return it in the stamped-addressed envelope. If no response was received after two weeks, then a phone call or home visit was made where possible. A second letter was sent to youths who could not be contacted any other way. Where a youth had difficulty with reading or writing, another person was asked to assist.

Lists of youths were sent monthly to the records section of the Office of Corrections, and where necessary, arrangements were made for access to prisons in order that the follow-up questionnaire could be completed. The police records branch was also contacted by mail on a monthly basis and details of post-release offences and penalties were provided.

4.0 Conclusion

This method chapter has presented the rationale, sample selection, instruments, and procedure for the research. The next chapter presents the data yielded by the various instruments and analyses that data.

CHAPTER 2

ANALYSIS OF DATA

1.0 Introduction

This chapter analyses the data collected by administration of the research instruments as outlined in the previous chapter in response to the three research questions.

These questions are:

1. Is there a relationship between training program experience and post-release employment and recidivism outcomes?

2. Is there a relationship between previous institutional and schooling experience and post-release employment and recidivism outcomes?

3. Can more effective training programs be developed for community re-integration of young persons.

1.1 Research Question One.

Is there a relationship between training program experience and subsequent employment and recidivism outcomes? In order to explore this question school and work program participants are

compared in the following areas:

1.1.1 relative program emphasis on 'social awareness';

1.1.2 changes in alienation scores;

1.1.3 ratings of program participation;

1.1.4 changes in length of employment and employment status pre and post program participation;

1.1.5 the relative proportions who re-offended;

1.1.6 Conclusion.

1.1.1 'Social Awareness'

The main purpose of the 'social awareness' interview is to assess whether Malmsbury school and work programs address the issues for curriculum development outlined in chapter one.

At the time of program completion analysis of variance produced no significant difference between the social awareness scores of school and work program participants. Given that the maximum score is 24 it would appear from the mean scores (school group = 4.30 and work program group = 4.27) that social awareness is not emphasised greatly in either school or work training programs at Malmsbury. The difference between scores of the two groups was not significant (F probability = 0.852).

1.1.2. Changes in Alienation Score

The alienation scale was administered pre and post program participation in order to assess changes in alienation scores as a consequence of program participation. The mean change for the school group was 0.34 whereas the mean change for the work program group was 4.13. The difference between change scores suggests that the work group felt less alienated at the time of release than they did at time of admission to Malmsbury, and this change is greater than the change made by the school group (F probability = 0.037). It is tentatively concluded that participation in work programs was significantly more likely to reduce sense of alienation, than was participation in school programs.

In order to attempt further explanation of the differences between the school and work program scores on the alienation scale, extreme changes in scores were compared. This comparision shows that of the 57 school program participants at the time of release, 9 youths felt less alienated by 10 points or more on completion of their program.

Of the 56 work program participants at time of release, 10 youths felt less alienated by 10 points or more on completion of their program.

When the scores of those youths who felt more alienated by at least 10 points were analysed, there were 9 from the school program participants and only one from the work

program participants.

It is therefore possible that the significant difference between school and work program participants' alienation scores was influenced by some school program participants feeling more alienated as well as work program participants generally feeling less alienated by an average of 4.13 points, i.e. the changes in work program participants were closer to the mean and showed one 'extreme' change in a negative direction. This difference is difficult to interpret. Perhaps the difference is due to the difference in the nature of the programs and those youths who are actually doing work feeling less alienated than those who are preparing for work, i.e. the school group. Alternatively, the difference may be due to the nature of the interaction between training program and institutional administration. It may be that custodial staff and education staff have a conflict of aims and are employed by different Government departments, whereas work training staff are employed by the same department as custodial staff. Some credence is given to this possibility by the differences in youth ratings between the institution as a place to be and training program as a place to be. These ratings are detailed in the next section.

1.1.3. Ratings of Program Participation.

All participants rated their total training experience i.e institution life and training program, on five rating scales. Each rating scale consisted of 5 points and ranged from +2 to -2.

The first two rating scales asked participants to rate 'Malmsbury as a place to be' and their 'training program as a place to be'. Youths tended to rate their training program, whether school or work, positively, whereas ratings from 'Malmsbury as a place to be' were evenly divided between positive and negative. Only 5 youths, out of the entire sample of 113 youths, rated their training program negatively. All five took work training programs, although a further 7 work program participants used the zero category and 11 school program participants used the zero category. When these ratings were accounted for, a total of 44 (78.6%) work program participants rated their program positively. When the 11 zero ratings were substracted from the 57 school program ratings 46 (80.7%) school program participants rated their program positively.

These proportions of positive ratings for training programs were higher than for the ratings of the youth training centre as a whole. 'Malmsbury as a place to be' was rated positively by 43 (38.0%) of the total sample at time of release i.e. 113 youths, and negatively by 42 (37.2%) of the total sample. Within the school group 23 (40.4%) rated 'the place' positively and 22 (38.6%) made negative ratings. The work group ratings of 'the place'

differed slightly in that 20 (35.7%) made positive ratings and 20 (35.7%) made negative ratings. Overall it appears that both school and work groups are ambivalent about 'Malmsbury as a place to be' whereas both groups are quite positive in their ratings of training progams, more especially the school group - see Table 4.

TABLE 4

Ratings of 'Malmsbury as a Place to be' According to Training Program.

Item	Mean Rating		Significance
	School Group	Work Group	
Malmsbury as a place to be	-0.07	-0.30	F = 0.288
Training programs as a to be	1.27	1.07	F = 0.230

The positive mean rating of school programs appears to conflict with the alienation change score in that while no member of the school group rated school programs negatively, the school group changed its alienation score to a significantly lesser degree than the work group. A possible explanation is that the domains of the alienation scale (work motivation, social tolerance, and personal adequacy) do not measure the same domain as the program rating scale.

There is a similar apparent disparity between alienation change scores and the two rating scales on involvement in activities at Malmsbury youth training centre. Youths rated, on a 5-point rating scale, their own degree of involvement in activities at Malmsbury, and then the degree of involvement of their closest peers.

The mean rating of personal involvement was 3.3, with the school group mean at 3.5 and the work group at 3.2. When analysis of variance was used to test for significance of the difference in ratings between the school and work group, the difference was not significant (F probability = 0.425). There was also no significant difference between school and work group ratings of closest peer involvement. The mean rating for the whole group was 3.0, and although the means for school (2.7) and work groups (3.3) appeared different, analysis of variance yielded no significant difference (F probability = 0.109). However, when the differences between self-ratings and ratings of peers were computed a significant difference was found. The mean difference

for the whole group was 0.3 but the mean difference for the school group was 0.8 and the work group -0.1. This difference between school and work group ratings of self in relation to peer involvement was significant (F probability = 0.014) with the school group rating their own involvement above that of their closest peers, and the work group rating their peers' involvement slightly higher than their own. These comparative ratings are presented in Table 5.

TABLE 5

Ratings of Personal and Closest Peer Involvement in Activities at Malmsbury according to Training Program.

Item	Mean Rating		Significance
	School Group	Work Group	
Personal involvement in activities	3.5	3.2	F = 0.425.
Closest peer involvement in activities	2.7	3.3	F = 0.109.
Difference between ratings of personal and closest peer involvement in activities	0.8-	-0.1	F = 0.014.

Ratings on another rating scale ('Malmsbury as a place to be') provide data which suggest that although training programs were generally rated positively and personal involvement in activities was rated positively, especially by school program participants, there was no difference between the groups in ratings of 'Malmsbury as preparation for life outside'. It appears that while youths were sensitive to particular aspects of life at Malmsbury, they either did not generalise these aspects to their perceptions of their preparation needs for life outside, or their perceived needs were much greater than what was provided at Malmsbury. Youths rated 'Malmsbury as preparation for life outside' on a 5-point scale from -2 to +2. The mean rating for the whole group was -0.045. The mean rating for the school group was -0.04 and for the work group -0.05. Thus, the ratings were very slightly on the negative side of zero, neither significantly better nor worse for the period of training at Malmsbury. Both groups shared this feeling about equally (F probability = 0.346). Analysis of outcomes, in terms of employment and recidivism six months after release, may provide further data on the issue of preparation for life outside. Before proceeding to analyse post-release data, the pre and post program data is summarised briefly.

Whilst at Malmsbury both school and work groups reported a low emphasis on 'social awareness' in training program content. On alienation change scores the work group scored significantly greater change than the school group when pre and post training program scores were compared. These data were not entirely

consistent with ratings of training programs and involvement in activities which, overall, slightly favoured the school group. However, neither school nor work group rated preparation for life outside in a positive direction.

1.1.4 Post-release Employment

The post-release employment data were analysed for differences between school and work groups.

Youths were compared according to the number of weeks worked in the 26 weeks pre and post Malmsbury training in order to estimate whether training program participation increased post-release length of employment, allowing for possible influence of job market fluctuations.

Youths were also compared according to job status ranking in the 26 weeks pre and post Malmsbury training. Additionally, youths stated what sort of work they expected to get after release and what sort of work they would select if they had a free choice. This latter response was called 'work aspiration', and differences between expectations and aspirations were based on the Daniel job status scale.

With regard to the number of weeks worked, the 45 school group youths who were traced 6-months after release, had increased their mean number of weeks worked by 2.7 weeks, from 10.2 (pre-program) to 12.9 (post-program) weeks out

of 26 weeks. The 43 work group youths, who were traced 6-months after release, had increased their mean number of weeks worked by 5.7 weeks, from 9.9 (pre-program) to 15.6 (post-program) weeks out of 26 weeks. While the work group increased the number of weeks worked by more than the school group, the difference was not significant (F probability = 0.191).

It is possible that the increase in number of weeks worked may not be as great as recorded above. Of the 45 youths completing a school program and traced 6 months after release, the number employed increased from 28 (62.2%) to 34 (75.5%). Of the 43 youths completing a work program and traced 6 months after release, the number employed increased from 29 (67.4%) to 36 (83.7%). If the total number of weeks worked is divided by the total number of workers pre and post release for school and work groups it can be seen that 28 school program youths were employed an average of 16.39 weeks out of the 26 weeks pre-program. Post-release, 34 school program youths were employed for an average of 17.07 weeks out of 26, a mean increase of less than one week.

Applying the same method of calculation to the work program group it can be seen that 29 youths worked for an average of 14.67 weeks pre-program. Post release, 36 work program youths worked for an average of 18.6 weeks out of 26, which is an increase of 4 weeks over pre-program number of weeks worked. Thus it can be seen that the work

program group tended to increase the proportion of youths employed and the number of weeks worked, more than the school program group.

The other aspect of employment outcome for evaluation is whether the status of employment gained post-release was higher than the status of employment prior to program participation. According to the Daniel Job Prestige Scale, job status ranking deteriorated slightly for school program participants (from 46 to 47.8 ranking) and improved slightly for work program participants (from 48 to 47.3 ranking). Whereas both groups expected an improvement in job status ranking, the school program group expected (44.2) and aspired (34.4) to slightly higher status jobs than the work program participants (expected 45.4 and aspired to 38). These data suggest that whereas school program participants tended to have their job status expectations raised, they did not gain higher status employment upon release. It is also possible that work program participants were able to find work more closely related to the work skills gained through program participation at Malmsbury. While the data, summarised in Table 6, are not conclusive, it appears that both school and work program participants placed some value on the potential of those programs to improve their job status. Given that the Daniel Scale ranks jobs from 1-54, the post-release movement up or down from the botton end of the scale was minimal and remained at about the level of process worker or labourer. The aspired level of

employment is in the skilled tradesman area of the status ranks. These aspirations may not be out of reach of these youths if difficulties caused by low rates of pay for apprentices, especially for this age group, can be overcome. In view of re-offending rates some assistance to training program designers to overcome these impediments may be seen as a preventive strategy.

TABLE 6

Mean Job Status Rankings Pre and Post Training Program.

Training Program	Pre	Post	Expected Post	Aspired Post.
S chool	46.0	47.8	44.2	34.4
Work	48.0	47.3	45.4	38.0

1.1.5 Re-Offending

In the six months following release 17 (37.8%) of the school group and 18 (41.8%) of the work group re-offended. There was no significant difference in re-offending rates according to program participation (F probability = 0.552). However, the rate of re-offending may be seen as unacceptably high and further analysis of data, according to whether youths were employed or not at the time of re-offending, suggests that those youths who have a job were less likely to re-offend as only 7 out of 35 re-offenders (20%) had jobs at the time of re-offending. This rate of re-offending may be reduced further if youth training centre programs were directly linked to real job opportunities in the community, preferably with access to permanency.

Before exploring this possibility further, analysis of data according to categories of offender, may facilitate refinement of program strategies for reduction of recidivism, and this is attempted in response to Research question No.2.

1.1.6 Conclusion

In exploring the question of a possible relationship between training program experience and subsequent employment and recidivism outcomes it was found that there were some temporary gains from training program participation. These gains are seen in the decrease in alienation of work program participants, and the greater sense of involvement in activities by school program participants relative to their closest peers. School and work program participants tended to rate their training situation significantly more positively than their ratings of the institution as a place to be. However, there were no apparent long-term gains in terms of increase in number of weeks worked or status of jobs gained. Re-offending rates also reflected no significant difference between the two training groups and the overall proportion of youths re-offending was 39.8%. There was no apparent relationship between type of training program and subsequent employment and recidivism outcomes.

2.1 Research Question Two

Is there a relationship between previous institutional and schooling experience and subsequent post-release employment and recidivism outcomes? In order to explore this question the previous schooling level of three offender groups (State Ward, Young Offender, Adult Offender) were analysed according to whether youths had reached Year 9, or whether they had gone beyond Year 9 to post-compulsory levels of schooling.

Data from the social awareness interview, administered upon entry to Malmsbury and related to previous school curriculum are also introduced into the data analysis in exploring this second research question.

The remaining areas for data analysis are the same as for the first research question except that the analysis pursues differences between offender groups rather than differences between training groups.

The areas for comparative analysis are:

2.2.1 previous schooling levels;

2.2.2 ratings of previous schooling;

2.2.3 'social awareness' content of previous schooling;

2.2.4 present school expectations and aspirations;

2.2.5 change in alienation scores;

2.2.6 ratings of training program participation;

2.2.7 change in duration and status of employment;

2.2.8 re-offending;

2.2.1. Previous Schooling Levels

Analysis of previous schooling levels found that of the 32 State Wards, 6 had gone past Year 9 level at school; none of the Young Offenders had gone past Year 9 level at school; and all of the Adult Offenders had gone past Year 9. Young Offenders differ from State Wards in that the Young Offenders left school by the age of 15 and were subsequently institutionalised for offences, whereas State Wards were institutionalised before the age of 15 for being 'in need of care and protection'.

Adult Offenders are similar to Young Offenders in that their institutionalisation begins shortly after their decision to leave school, although that decision is made two years later than for Young Offenders. There is no apparent reason why some youths leave earlier than others or whether there is a causal relationship between leaving school and getting into serious trouble. However, it appears that the three groups do have different levels of schooling achievement. The mean level of schooling for State Wards is 8.9 years; for Young Offenders the mean level is 8.5 years; and for Adult Offenders the mean level is 10.3 years. Analysis of variance attained significance for the differences in levels of schooling for the three groups (F probability = 0.000).

2.2.2 Ratings of Previous Schooling.

The significance of the difference in schooling levels between the offender groups suggests that the groups may have differing experiences of schooling. The data collected through rating scales at the time of entry to Malmsbury may elaborate on these differences between the groups. Youths were asked to rate, on 5-point scales, their involvement in school activities, school as a place to be, and school as preparation for life. On involvement in school activities all three offender groups were significantly different from each other. Adult offenders were most positive in their ratings with a mean of 3.3; Young Offenders were less positive with a mean rating of 2.5; and State Wards were least positive with a mean rating of 2.1. These mean ratings suggest that the more schooling a student had, the more likely he was to be involved in school activities. This proposition holds for Adult Offenders and Young Offenders but not necessarily for State Wards, some of whom had a lot of schooling, but at a low level in institution and mainstream schools. Movement of State Wards from one school setting to another may have impeded involvement in school activities, or alternatively they may not have been involved by schools they attended for reasons of poverty, low attendance, transience or similar organisational difficulties. For whatever set of reasons, the three groups were significantly different on involvement (F probability = 0.001).

On the rating scale for involvement in school activities

of their closest friends at school the mean rating for State Ward peers was 3.1; for Young Offenders 3.1, and Adult Offenders 3.7. These differences do not attain significance (F probability = 0.206) However, all three groups rate their closest friends more involved in schooling than themselves. State Wards rated their closest friends one whole point more involved (2.1 vs 3.1) than themselves; Young Offenders rated their closest friends .6 more involved than themselves (2.5 vs 3.1) and Adult Offenders rated their closest friends .4 more involved than themselves (3.3 vs 3.7) The size of the trends towards greater involvement of peers do not attain significance (F probability = 0.088).

T-tests were carried out to test the significance of differences between pairs of offender groups' self-peer ratings. It is found that there was no significant difference between State Ward self-peer ratings of involvement and those of Young Offenders (t=0.566, two-tailed test), but that Adult Offenders' self-peer ratings differed significantly from both State Wards (t = 0.001, two-tailed test) and Young Offenders (t =0.007, two-tailed test).

Thus Adult Offenders perceived themselves as more involved in school activities than did State Wards and Young Offenders, and the difference between self and peer ratings was significantly less for Adult Offenders than for State Wards and Young Offenders. This suggests that

Adult Offenders were more mutually involved in schooling at a higher level of involvement. State Wards and Young Offenders tended to be more vicariously involved through their closest friends than through direct personal involvement in activities. Somehow they tended to feel only marginally involved in school activities.

This sense of marginality is again reflected in ratings of 'school as a place to be'. Youths were asked to rate school as a place to be on a 5-point scale from -2 to +2. All three offender groups were different from each other with Adult Offenders rating 'school as a place to be' higher than Young Offenders and State Wards lowest. The mean rating by State Wards was -1.03; by Young Offenders, -0.48; and by Adult Offenders, +0.56. Analysis of variance attains strong significance for these differences (F probability = 0.000). Thus Adult Offenders rated 'School as a place to be' and their involvement in schooling activities more highly than the other two groups. State Wards rated 'school as a place to be ' lowest and their involvement in activities was also lowest. Young Offenders were also negative about 'school as a place to be', but not so negative as State Wards, and their level of involvement was also significantly higher than State Wards. It appears then that perceived level of involvement and perception of school as a place to be were

related but there were no data to clarify whether one caused the other. This finding is consistent with the literature on school effects (Pink, 1982; Polk. 1969;) which suggests that school organisational factors influence liking and involvement in schooling, and that school achievement is affected by organisational factors. While State Ward data on mean level of schooling reached, suggest that they are not the lowest achievers, the difference between State Wards and Young Offenders appears to turn on six Wards who went past Year 9 at school. Further analysis of these cases may provide some directions for the development of more positive schooling effects for State Wards in the future. Impetus for such analysis is provided by the outcome of ratings of school as preparation for life outside of school.

Youths were asked to rate 'school as preparation for life outside of school' on a 5-point scale from -2 to +2. All three groups were significantly different from each other in their ratings. All three groups perceived school negatively in terms of its preparation for life outside of school, with State Wards feeling most negatively, and Adult Offenders least negatively. The mean rating for State Wards was 1.39; for Young Offenders, 0.66; and for Adult Offenders, -0.19. Analysis of variance attained significance for these differences between the offender groups (F probability = 0.001). This outcome lends support to the earlier contention about school effects and goes further, because the Adult Offender ratings on

'preparation for life' suggest that even if school is liked and involvement quite positive, the relevance of schooling to life outside of school is not necessarily assured by the personal compatibility of the school environment.

The social awareness interview data provide another perspective but with similar conclusions. The social awareness interview focusses on school curriculum content rather than the youth's response to the process of schooling.

2.2.3. 'Social Awareness' Content of Previous Schooling.

The social awareness interview was administered before and after program participation to the 113 youths who completed their training programs at Malmsbury. The purpose of the pre-program administration of the interview was to assess whether previous school curriculum addressed the areas of employment, participation in the democratic process, cultural connection, and human relationships.

Twenty-four points were allocated to responses on the social awareness interview, six points to each of four areas - world of work, decision-making, cultural connection, and social relationships. The mean scores for the offender groups' recollection of social awareness content of previous schooling were: 5.4 for State Wards; 4.26 for Young Offenders; and 7.65 for Adult Offenders.

These mean scores are significantly different (F probability = 0.004). The lowest mean score by the Young Offender group may be partially explained by their early school leaving and possible difficulty in recollecting curriculum content after a two to six-year break from schooling. On the other hand State Wards tended to keep in contact with schooling through institutions but their social awareness scores were not as high as Adult Offenders, who all reached at least Year 10 level of schooling.

However, even the comparatively high mean score of the Adult Offender group reached less than one-third (7.65 points) out of the possible score (24 points). Thus, social awareness content, even at higher levels of secondary schools appeared to be inadequate. Data from another 'social awareness' study in 11 Victorian secondary schools support this observation (see Appendix 4).

In the context of the above negative data about previous school curriculum content and process, data on present schooling expectations and aspirations may elaborate on the effects of previous schooling.

2.2.4 Present School Expectations and Aspirations

At initial interview youths were asked: What level of schooling do you expect to reach? The three offender groups responded differently to this question. The State

Wards' mean expected level of schooling was 0.51 years higher than their previous schooling; the Young Offenders' mean expected level of schooling was 0.24 years higher than their previous schooling; and the Adult Offenders' mean expected level of schooling was 0.15 years higher than their previous schooling. Analysis of variance attained significance (F probability = 0.000).

While the groups were significantly different in schooling expectations, it can be noted that no group expects more than 6 months' additional schooling, and that Adult Offenders expect least although they already have most schooling. For youths in the 17-21 year age group with at least Year 10 level of schooling, low expectation of further schooling may appear to be a logical adjustment to needs for employment and financial independence. A related question is whether the youths aspire to further schooling even though their expectations are low, and such a question was asked at initial interview, where all youths were asked: If you had a free choice, what level of schooling would you want to reach? State Ward, Young Offender, and Adult Offender groups responded differently with respect to schooling aspirations. The mean aspired level of schooling for State Wards was 1.42 years higher than previous schooling; for Young Offenders the mean aspired level of schooling was 0.89 years higher than previous schooling; and for Adult Offenders, 1.22 years higher than previous schooling. Analysis of variance attains strong significance between offender group

aspirations (F probability = 0.000).

Translated into actual levels of schooling, State Ward aspirations are higher than the other groups but achievement of their aspirations would bring them up to Year 10 and possibly Year 11, which is the same as Adult Offenders have already reached. Adult Offenders, while they have low expectations, aspire to year 12 level. This finding provides some for support Connell et al's (1975) finding that low status youth tend to have similar schooling aspirations to higher status youth but lower expectations although the Young Offender group did not aspire to as much further schooling as the other two groups. This may be due to interviewing them after they had left school for more than two years. However, while all three groups aspired to more schooling, it appears from the various ratings and the social awareness interview that the three offender groups are quite different in terms of their previous schooling and the extent of their present schooling expectations and aspirations. These comparative data are found in Table 7.

TABLE 7

Differences in Experience and Perceptions of Previous Schooling by Three Offender Groups.

Item	Means S. Ward	Y. Offender	A. Offender	Significance
Level of schooling reached.	8.9	8.5	10.3	F = 0.000
Expected further schooling.	0.51	0.24	0.15	F = 0.000
Aspired further schooling.	1.42	0.89	1.22	F = 0.000
Personal involvement in school activities	2.1	2.5	3.3	F = 0.001
Closest peer involvement in school activities.	3.1	3.1	3.7	F = 0.206
Difference between personal and closest peer involvement.	1.0	0.6	0.4	F = 0.088
	1.0		0.4	t = 0.001
		0.6	0.4	t = 0.007
	1.0	0.6		t = 0.566
School as a place to be.	-1.03	-0.48	0.56	F = 0.000
School as preparation for life.	-1.39	-0.66	-0.19	F = 0.001
Social awareness score.	5.4	4.62	7.65	F = 0.004

2.2.5 Alienation

Having established that there are significant differences in previous schooling participation, present expectations and aspirations, the next stage in exploring the question of whether these differencese are reflected in differential program outcomes, is taken by evaluating whether differing levels of alienation existed upon entry to Malmsbury and whether training program participation made any difference to alienation scores. The maximum score on the alienation scale is 132 and the scale is scored in the direction of decreasing alienation so that the higher the score, the lower the alienation. Upon entry to Malmsbury the State Wards' mean alienation score was 86.4; Young Offenders', 92.4; and Adult Offenders, 92.5. At time of release all groups had improved their score so that the mean for State Wards was 91.03; for Young Offenders, 95.15; and for Adult Offenders, 96.96.

There was a trend towards significance in the differences in alienation scores between the three groups at time of entry (F probability = 0.068) but not at time of release (F probability = 0.202). The differences between pre and post scores were also not significant (F probability = 0.357). Although the State Wards improved their scores relative to Young Offenders (State Ward mean change = 4.63 whereas Young Offender mean change = 2.75) this did not

attain significance (t probability = 0.869, two-tailed test). These data are summarised in Table 8.

The discussion in response to Question one, suggested that there were significant differences in change scores when data were analysed according to training program participation. (F probability = 0.037). A two-way analysis of variance was carried out to establish whether there was significant interaction between offender groups and program groups. The result was not significant (F probability = 0.534). It therefore appears that changes in alienation scores are more likely to be related to type of training program participation i.e. work program, than to groupings based on previous institution and schooling experience.

TABLE 8

Mean Alienation Scores by Three Offender Groups.

Data Collection Points.	S. Ward.	Y. Offender	A. Offender	Significance
1. (Pre-program).	86.4	92.4	92.5	F = 0.068
2. (Post-program).	91.03	95.15	96.96	F = 0.202
Difference between 1 and 2.	4.63	2.75	4.46	F = 0.357

2.2.6 Ratings of Training Program Participation.

While there was no significant change in alienation scores for offender groups as a consequence of training program participation, specific aspects of program participation are not directly evaluated by the alienation scale. Youths were therefore requested to respond to the same rating scales applied to Malmsbury training as were applied to previous schooling. These rating scale data have already been analysed according to training program participation (see Question One). It was found that both school and work groups rated their training programs positively and that school program participants rated their own involvement in activities more highly than the ratings of their closest peers' involvement and this was significantly different from work group ratings. Both school and work groups rated 'Malmsbury as preparation for life outside' slightly in the negative. When these data were analysed according to offender group no significant differences were found. Firstly, there was no significant difference in 5-point scale (-2 to +2) ratings of 'Malmsbury as a place to be'. The mean rating by State Wards was -0.06; by Young Offenders, -0.07; and by Adult Offenders, -0.29. The mean ratings suggest a slight trend towards Adult Offenders disliking Malmsbury more strongly than the other two groups but the difference was not significant

(F probability = 0.512). A similar rating scale for 'training program as a place to be' found no significant difference between the offender groups. The mean rating by State Wards was 1.25; by Young Offenders, 1.24; and by Adult Offenders, 1.00 (F probability = 0.476). All three offender groups rate training programs more positively than 'Malmsbury as a place to be'. This is a similar finding to the analysis of ratings according to training program group, i.e a consistent difference of around 1.3 rating points out of 5.

When ratings of involvement in activities were analysed it was found that the mean rating for personal involvement by State Wards was 3.22; for Young Offenders, 3.31; and for Adult Offenders, 3.44 (F probability = 0.823). The mean rating for closest peer involvement in activities for State Wards was 2.23; for Young Offenders, 3.11; and for Adult Offenders, 2.74 (F probability = 0.127).

When the differences between personal involvement rating and rating of closest peers' involvement were analysed for each offender group, a trend towards significance was found. The mean difference for State Wards was 0.99; for Young Offenders, 0.2; and for Adult Offenders, 0.7 (F probability = 0.069). It appears that the trend is towards State Wards being more involved in activities than their peers. This is in the opposite direction to their ratings of self and closest peers in relation to

previous schooling in which the mean ratings were 2.1 (self) and 3.1 (closest peers). Thus, State Wards rated their personal involvement in activities by 1.99 points higher in the Malmsbury situation than their rating of personal involvement in previous schooling. It is possible that this difference is partly due to school program participation at Malmsbury because 22 out of the 32 State Wards participated in school programs at Malmsbury. By contrast, the smaller difference between self and closest peer ratings for Young Offenders (0.2) may be partly attributable to 18 out of 29 Young Offenders being participants in work programs. Further support for program influence on the trends in differences between self and peer ratings is provided by the Adult Offender group where the entire difference (i.e. 0.7 points in their own favour) is composed of school program participants, because Adult Offender work program participants rated their own involvement exactly the same as that of their closest peers (i.e. 3.2 points).

These data suggest that training programs may have an impact on participant perceptions of their involvement in activities and further investigation of the school activities at Malmsbury relative to mainstream schooling may assist in program development at Malmsbury and in mainstream schools.

It is noted however, that alienation scale data suggest

that work program participation may influence positive change in alienation scores. This observation, taken together with the 'involvement in activities' data suggests that increased involvement in activities may not reduce alienation scores. Another perspective is provided by comparing 'Malmsbury as a place to be' and 'training programs as a place to be', ratings by State Wards relative to the other two offender groups. (see Table 9). State Wards are less negative about 'Malmsbury as a place to be' (-0.06) and more positive about 'training program as a place to be (1.25) than Adult Offenders (-0.29 and 1.00 repectively). Young Offenders differ only slightly in their ratings from State Wards (-0.07 and 1.24 respectively). Further research on insitutional climate is suggested by these comparisons in order to establish whether greater involvement in activities is related to a less negative reaction to insitutional life, and whether degree of negative reaction to insitutional life is related to length of previous institutionalisation.

Such a proposition would not be contradicted by the ratings of 'Malmsbury as preparation for life outside' which show a small trend towards State Wards rating Malmsbury lowest on preparation for life outside, and Adult Offenders rating their preparation highest even though they tended to like the place least. These data were provided by a 5-point rating scale (-2 to +2) of 'Malmsbury as preparation for life outside'. The mean

'preparation' rating by State Wards was -0.59; for Young Offenders, -0.52; and Adult Offenders, 0.07 (see Table 9). Analysis of variance found no significant difference between the ratings of the three offender groups (F probability = 0.073), but as the Adult Offender group mean appeared to differ from State Ward and Young Offender means, t-tests were carried out between pairs of groups. None of these t-tests attained significance (State Ward/Young Offender, t=0.922; State Ward/Adult Offender, t=0.321; and Young Offender/Adult Offender; t=0.383). The analysis of ratings according to training program participation (see research question one) also found no significant difference in the perceptions of youths of the preparatory role of school (mean = -0.04) and work programs (mean = -0.05) (F probability = 0.346).

Thus while offender groups differed in respect to previous institutional and schooling experience, there were no significant differences in perceptions of training program effects, when youths rated 'Malmsbury as preparation for life outside'. Employment and re-offending data tend to confirm the youths' 'no difference' ratings of their training program participation, and these data are detailed in the following sections of this exploration of research question two.

TABLE 9

Offender Group Ratings of Training Program Participation.

Item	Mean Rating S. Wards	Y. Offenders	A. Offenders	Significance
Malmsbury as a place to be.	-0.06	-0.07	-0.29	F = 0.512
Training program as a place to be.	1.25	1.24	1.00	F = 0.476
Personal involvement in activities.	3.22	3.31	3.44	F = 0.823
Closest peer involvement in activities.	2.23	3.11	2.74	F = 0.127
Difference between self & peer ratings on involvement.	0.99	0.20	0.70	F = 0.069
Malmsbury as preparation for life outside.	-0.59	-0.52	0.07	F = 0.073

2.2.7 Change in Duration and Status of employment.

Offender groups were compared according to the number of weeks worked pre and post Malmsbury training in order to estimate whether previous institutional and schooling experience were related to employment record pre and post Malmsbury training. Offender groups were also compared according to job status in the 26 weeks pre and post Malmsbury training. Additionally, offender groups were compared on the type of work they expected to get after release and the type of work they would select if they had a free choice. This 'free choice' was called 'work aspiration'.

With regard to the number of weeks worked, the 32 State Wards who were traced 6 months after release, had increased their mean number of weeks worked by 1.0 week, from 9.37 to 10.37 weeks out of 26 weeks. The 29 Young Offenders who were traced 6 months after release, had increased their mean number of weeks worked by 5.4 weeks, from 9.51 to 14.93 weeks out of 26 weeks. The 27 Adult Offenders who were traced 6 months after release, had increased their mean number of weeks worked by 6.8 weeks, from 11.4 to 18.2 weeks out of 26 weeks.

These data on number of weeks worked suggest three aspects of difference between the offender groups. Firstly, at the pre-program stage, Adult Offenders worked a greater mean

number of weeks than the other two groups, but this difference was not significant (F probability = 0.259). Secondly, there was an apparent difference between pre and post number of weeks worked for each of the groups, but this difference was not significant (F probability = 0.228). A third level of difference was apparent in the post program weeks worked. Adult Offenders increased their mean number of weeks worked by 6.8 weeks, Young Offenders by 5.4 weeks, and State Wards by 1 week. These differences attained significance (F probability = 0.015) This suggests that while all three offender groupings increase the number of weeks employed, the pre-program proportional differences between offender groupings in number of weeks employed were magnified to a significant degree by post-program employment experience. State Wards were the least successful group in length of employment following program participation at Malmsbury.

These differences are further expanded by consideration of the numbers of youths employed during the pre and post program 6-month periods. At the pre-program stage 19 (59.4%) State Wards gained at least one job; 19 (65.5%) Young Offenders gained at least one job; and 19 (70.4%) Adult Offenders gained at least one job. At the post-release stage 22 (68.8%) State Wards gained at least one job; 23 (79.3%) Young Offenders gained at least one job; and 25 (92.6%) Adult Offenders gained at least one job. Whether post-release employment is viewed from the perspective of mean number of weeks worked or from the

perspective of number of youths gaining employment, State Wards did worst of the three offender groups.

From the perspective of job status ranking the State Wards did slightly worse than the other two groups. Given that the Daniel Prestige Scale ranks jobs down to 54, the mean change in job status from 46 to 48 for State Wards was a small reduction in employment status, whereas Young Offenders stayed on a ranking of 48, and Adult Offenders stayed on a ranking of 46. The difference between a status ranking of 46 to 48 is not large, but it is consistent with the proposition that previous institutionalisation and schooling may affect program outcomes. The areas of job expectation and aspiration provide further support for such a proposition.

State Wards expected post release employment with a mean status ranking of 44.6 which is 3.5 rankings above what they gained (i.e 48.1); Young Offenders expected post release employment with a mean status ranking of 45.3, which is 3.2 rankings above what they gained (i.e. 48.5); and Adult Offenders expected post release employment with a mean status ranking of 44.8 which is 1.5 rankings above what they gained (i.e. 46.3). The State Ward mean job ranking expectation (44.6) was marginally higher than Adult Offenders (44.8) and Young Offenders (45.3). At time of release, State Ward mean job aspirations (37.0) were also marginally higher than Young Offenders (37.6) but lower than Adult Offenders (33.8).

Taken together the expectations and aspirations data suggest that at the time of release from Malmsbury, all three offender groups expected to gain employment of slightly higher status than they had prior to detention, and if they could get the job of their choice this would be from 7 to 10 status rankings higher than what they expected they would get and 11 or 12 status rankings higher than the jobs they actually gained. Further interpretation of employment expectations and aspirations is complicated by the 12 State Wards, 10 Young Offenders and 3 Adult Offenders who responded "don't know" to the job expectation question, and a smaller proportion who responded "don't know" to the job aspiration question - 3 State Wards, 2 Young Offenders, and one Adult Offender. A possible explanation for the increased response for the "aspiration" question over the "expectation" question is that expectations relate to the realities of the job market whereas aspirations do not necessarily require consideration of the availability of jobs or accessibility to credentials that may be pre-requisite for achievement of aspired career.

The low job status issue stretches across all three offender groups (See Table 10) and raising job status is a problem for training program designers. However, the problem of getting and keeping a job is easiest for Adult Offenders and hardest for State Wards.

TABLE 10

Mean Job Status Rankings Pre and Post Training Program According to Offender Group.

Offender Group.	Pre.	Post.	Expected Post.	Aspired Post.
State Ward.	45.9	48.1	44.6	37.0.
Young Offender.	48.5	48.5	45.3	37.6.
Adult Offender.	46.6	46.3	44.8	33.8.

2.2.8 Re-Offending.

Within 6 months of release 13 (40.63%) State Wards had re-offended and nine of these resulted in sentence of detention; 13 (44.83%) Young Offenders had re-offended and five of these resulted in sentences of detention; and 8 (29.63%) Adult Offenders had re-offended, five of these resulting in sentences of detention.

The proportion of Adult Offenders re-offending was less than the other two groups but analysis of variance did not attain significance for the differences between the groups (F probability = 0.125). T-tests were then carried out for pairs of offender groups and the difference between the Adult Offender group and the other two groups showed a trend towards significance. The difference between State Ward and Adult Offender rates of re-offending approached

significance (t probability = 0.063) as did the difference between the Young Offender groups and the Adult Offender group (t probability = 0.063). These data suggest that youths with low institutionalisation and high level of schooling were more likely to gain employment and stay out of trouble.

2.2.9 Conclusion.

When the data were analysed according to offender groups based on previous institutionalisation and schooling experience, it was found that the group with lowest institutional experience and highest schooling experience (i.e. Adult Offenders) felt most positively about their previous schooling and appeared more 'socially aware' as a result of their additional schooling. However, their expectations of further schooling were for less additional schooling than the other two groups, and their aspirations for additional schooling were not as great as the State Ward group. In effect this means that State Wards tend to aspire to as much schooling as Adult Offenders have already achieved and Adult Offenders want little more than they have already achieved.

When alienation change scores and program rating scales data were analaysed, no significant differences were found between the groups. On employment outcomes, a larger proportion of Adult Offenders were found to gain more work than Young Offenders and State Wards.

It is concluded that employment opportunities were no worse after training program participation, but that pre-existing differences between groups were perpetuated, and possibly magnified, with Adult Offenders having the best chance of gaining and keeping employment and State Wards the worst chance. On the recidivism criterion Adult Offenders had the lowest proportion of re-offenders within six months of release and State Wards and Young Offenders were more likely to re-offend. These data suggest that there was a relationship between previous institutional and schooling experience, and subsequent post-release employment and recidivism outcomes. Training programs appeared to have no differential impact on these outcomes.

3.1 Research Question Three.

Can more effective training programs be developed for achievement of the community re-integration goal?

The data presented on training programs in exploring question one, suggest that training programs can produce measurable change in participants. Perhaps if the practical skills emphasis of work training programs and the degree of involvement in activities rated by school program participants, were combined, all participants would leave the youth training centre with significantly improved alienation scores. Greater emphasis on

social awareness aspects of curriculum content might enable participants to improve their understanding of, and participation in, conventional society.

Participant ratings of training programs were quite positive (mean = 1.17 on a -2 to +2 scale) and despite the less favourable rating of 'Malmsbury as a place to be (mean = -0.13) the proportion of youths gaining employment in the first six months after release (79.5%) was greater than in the six months prior to detention (64.8%). The status ranking of post-release employment (47.6 out of 54) was negligibly lower than pre-detention employment (47.0), which means that the youths' job prospects are not worsened by their negative ratings of detention experience, and it could be that the training programs countered the perceived negative aspects of the custodial environment.

It is also noted that while Malmsbury training was rated negatively 'as preparation for life outside' (mean = -0.36 on a -2 to +2 scale) this was not so negative as ratings for 'school as preparation for life' (mean = -0.78). Given that 'Malmsbury as preparation for life' included the custodial as well as the training aspect of institutional life, schooling may have been remembered as having slightly less relevance to perceived needs for community living than Malmsbury training programs.

However, the re-offending rates suggest that for State Wards (40.6%) and Young Offenders (44.8%) in particular, training programs could be more effectively directed at reducing recidivism. Training programs alone may not be able to reduce

recidivism. Other things would also need to change in order that youths secure their place in society. Specifically, the world of work appears to lack access to long-term employment and promotional career structures. The data presented in exploring question two, supported a structural change argument in that the most disadvantaged group in terms of previous experience i.e State Wards, remained unequal to other groups, with respect to employment, following release. Conversely, the group with highest schooling and least institutional experience i.e Adult Offenders had better employment prospects upon release.

The data on recidivism suggested that the least qualified youths, i.e State Wards (40.6 recidivism) and Young Offenders (44.8% recidivism) were more likely to get into trouble again and Adult Offenders (29.6% recidivism) were less likely to get into trouble again. These data may be interpreted as support for training programs that raise schooling levels, but additional data on offending suggest that other factors may have operated to increase recidivism rates for least qualified youths. These data were collected via a trouble index which combines number of offences, seriousness of offence, and length of sentence.

The trouble index was applied to offences which led to detention at Malmsbury. These calculations resulted in Adult Offenders gaining the highest mean trouble index (171.25); State Wards the next highest (128.0); and Young Offenders the lowest (119.5). This means that Adult Offenders were the most serious offenders either in the nature or the number of their offences. The Adult Offender mean trouble index was significantly different from State

Wards (t = 0.033, two-tailed test) and Young Offenders (t =0.005, two-tailed test). As the Adult Offender group was the most highly schooled group it would appear that seriousness of offence was not correlated with low schooling. Therefore increased schooling level may not necessarily reduce State Ward and Young Offender prospects for further institutionalisation. The criteria for detention at a youth training centre may also need revision because these may increase the chances of institutionalisation of State Wards. Clause 476A of the Victorian Crimes Act states, in part:

> the Court may, having regard to the nature of the offence and to the age character and antecedents of the offender.... direct that the offender be detained in a youth training centre

As the age of State Wards,, Young Offenders, and Adult Offenders is within the range 17-21 years, the age criterion is unlikely to account for the difference between trouble index scores. The offence criterion may make some difference to sentencing but as Adult Offenders were more serious in this regard, this seriousness is most likely balanced by one or both of the remaining criteria, i.e 'character and antecedents'. Antecedents presumably refers to previous court appearances and if 'character' is assessed by experts such as private psychologists or previous employers, then State Wards tend to be disadvantaged by the sentencing process due to lack of money and work experience. Adult Offenders could also have an advantage over Young Offenders on the 'antecedents' criterion because Young Offenders have a longer institutional record.

Despite possible advantages over State Wards and Young Offenders

in terms of schooling, employment and court process, Adult Offenders had a re-offending rate of 29.6% in the first six months after release. While this was lower than for the other two groups, there is still some room for improvement in program effectiveness, both in terms of program design within the youth training centre and also in terms of transition arrangements to study and work opportunities in the community.

CHAPTER 3

A MULTI-DISCIPLINARY BASIS FOR CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

1.0 Introduction

General education theory may not be adequate to address the situation of detained youth and this chapter proposes to broaden the knowledge base for curriculum design by exploring multi-disciplinary sources including social psychology, delinquency theory, educational sociology, and education theory.

2.0 Social Interactionist Theory

Social interactionist theory has to do with the nature of the interaction between the individual and society. One type of interactionist theory was developed by Nisbett (1970) and is known as social bond theory. Social bond theory has its main focus on the strength of ties between the individual and society.

For Nisbett, social interaction can be symbolic rather than directly observable behaviour and there are several key patterns for interaction - exchange, co-operation, conformity, co-ercion, and conflict.

Other requisites of interaction are: social group membership of short or long duration; authority which provides an inner order for human association; social roles, designating normative expectations and actual performances; social statuses that indicate the system of stratification in society; and, social norms, which are the culturally acquired ends or guideposts of social interaction and social order.

These key concepts of social bond theory suggest that the main focus of interaction theory is on the dynamics of the

relationship between the individual and social institutions. This may include analysis of individual deviance and as well as structural characteristics, but not exclusively one or the other.

Bonding theory postulates that most people stay out of trouble most of the time because they are bonded to the conventional norms of society through their affiliations with a variety of social institutions such as home, school, church, and the work place. As long as ties to at least one of these remain strong an individual is likely to conform to the legimitate conventions of society.

In 1969, Hirschi refined social bond theory and postulated four control processes through which conformity is maintained. They are:

1. Commitment - the degree to which a person has interests that misconduct would jeopardise. That is, whenever deviant behaviour is contemplated, the costs of this deviant behaviour must also be considered, especially the risk of losing one's investment in conventional behaviour.

2. Attachment to other people. Violation of the norm is acting contrary to the wishes and expectations of others. A low level of attachment makes violation more likely.

3. Involvement in conventional activities, particularly one's time and energy allocation to activities that have perceived personal value in the future as well as the present e.g. doing homework.

4. Belief in the moral validity of social rules. Hirschi found a significant relationship between attachment and commitment to home and school, with respect for the law. According to Hirschi, once expediency becomes an individual's main criterion for whether to break the law or not, it is likely she/he will break the law when it appears to be to his/her advantage.

Hirschi claims that the effectiveness of these four control processes depends on affiliations with representatives of conventional organisations and groups. The stronger the ties,

the greater the control. The closeness of an affiliation in any one sector may fluctuate but most adults have a multiplicity of important conventional ties. Young people typically have fewer ties than adults so that if affiliations with family and school disintegrate there is little constraint against violation of the law.

Elliott, Ageton, and Canter (1979) have now proposed further refinement of social bond theory. Major variables in the model include two types of social bond: "integration", which is similar to Hirschi's concepts of involvement and commitment; and "commitment", which is similar to Hirschi's concept of attachment and belief. The authors also postulate what they call "attenuation experiences" such as failure which may loosen ties to conventional society.

Two causal paths to delinquency are postulated. The first path is characterised by weak integration into, and commitment to, the social order. Such youths do not subscribe to conventional goals and therefore involvement in a delinquent peer group reinforces and provides social support for delinquent behaviour.

The second path is characterised by initially strong bonds to the social order, and subsequent attenuation through failure experiences, negative labelling, social crisis, or disorganisation at home, school, or in the community. This weakening of social bonds is accompanied by exposure and commitment to delinquent peer groups. Individual, short-run patterns of delinquency without delinquent group support are also

possible for the "attenuated ties" group if social supports for conventional goals retain some of their rewards, because delinquent behaviour has social meaning and must be supported and rewarded by social groups if it is to be sustained.

The claim that behaviour has social meaning and that negative social interaction can weaken commitment to conventional behaviour and values, can be evaluated in the light of research into the effects of schooling on academic performance and behaviour outlined in chapter one. If bonding theory has a contribution to make in the explanation of delinquency causation, analysis of the interaction between the individual and social institutions of family, school, peers and work will provide supportive evidence about the extent of attenuation of conventional social ties. For example, in the case of State Wards, the State decides that family bonding is inadequate and seeks alternative means for conventional socialisation. However, movement from one officially approved protective or caring agency to another may attenuate social ties further and also reduce opportunities for enduring peer relationships. If this transient lifestyle is followed by low status and spasmodic employment, then the chances of State Wards developing conventional social ties may be further restricted. In the case of Young Offenders, lack of commitment to schooling may orient adolescents towards delinquent peers and consequently reduce employment opportunities. The attenuation of conventional social ties may not be as marked as for State wards but success experiences in training leading to more secure employment are necessary in order to arrest possible detachment from conventional social values.

In the case of Adult Offenders social ties of family and schooling are relatively intact although some failure experiences at school may have resulted in leaving school before completion of secondary school, followed by unsatisfying work options and an attenuation, hopefully only temporary, of social bond.

3.0 Education Theory - learning through social interaction.

The social bond explanation of delinquency also appears to be supported by the 'progressive' education movement. Dewey was one education theorist who saw the societal value of social interaction in schools. Dewey (1916) recommended in his book Democracy and Education that the entire school be organised as a miniature democracy so that all students could belong, and participate in, the development of the school system and, through experience, gradually learn how to apply scientific method to improve society. Dewey believed that education is essential for a democratic society and that democratic citizenship can best be taught through direct social experience.

Thelen (1960) applied Dewey's theory and combined the dynamics of democratic processes with the process of academic enquiry in his teaching strategy. Thelen starts from a view of man as primarily a social being. The personal autonomy of social beings cannot be maintained without reference to other people. In helping to establish social agreements, each individual helps to determine both prohibitions and freedom for action. The classroom is a miniature society and the social order is

negotiated by the members showing that they care about the way of life that develops there. Through negotiation students learn academic skills.

Carl Rogers (1979) takes yet another line of emphasis on the importance of human relationships in learning. In Freedom to Learn, Rogers details the development of the "self" through interaction with an empathetic teacher. The teacher nurtures students into an awareness of self and into the pursuit of social and academic goals. However, Rogers assumes that students are willing to be responsible for their own learning, and this assumption rests on another assumption, i.e. that the student is motivated to learn. The research on teacher expectations, outlined in chapter one, suggests that there is a growing body of evidence that would support the motivation assumption, and the argument that many students become unmotivated by alienating aspects of the school climate.

The work of Thelen and of Rogers comes together in their observations about social interaction. They part on the purpose and outcome of social interaction - Thelen goes in the direction of social action and Rogers in the direction of self development. Levin showed that the two directions are not necessarily incompatible.

4.0 Lewin's 'Field Theory' - the importance of learning context.

Kurt Lewin's "field theory" (1951) derives from Gestalt philosophy's tenet that the way an object is perceived is

determined by the total context or configuration in which the object is embedded. Perception is determined by relationships among components of a perceptual field rather than by the fixed characteristics of individual components of the perceptual field.

Lewin developed this "field theory" to explain that the behaviour of an individual at any one time relates directly to the individual's physical and psychological "field" (total situation) at that time. Field theory postulates that the individual's perception of the current physical situation combined with the individual's present psychological perception of reality, past psychological perception (memory) and future psychological perception (aspirations) combine to determine the individual's behavioural response to the present situation.

Lewin differed from most other personality theorists in that he did not categorise individual behaviour into pathological types because these provide a general prescription for action which may not necessarily address the individual's construction of his/her present reality. For Lewin, changing the dynamics presently impinging on the individual, brings about a new perception of reality for the individual and hence mobility from the previous perception in the direction of the changed perception.

In Lewin's own words:

> What is important in field theory is the way that the analysis proceeds. Instead of picking out one or another isolated element within a situation, the importance of which cannot be judged without consideration of the situation as a whole, field theory finds it advantageous, as a rule, to start with a characterization of the situation as a whole...

One implication of this for the school situation is that:

> Every child is sensitive, even to small changes in social atmosphere, such as the degree of friendliness or security. The teacher knows that success in teaching French, or any subject depends largely on the atmosphere he is able to create (p. 63).

Lewin was concerned that many learning experiments had been done with animals because this made a clear separation of motivational and cognitive problems very difficult. On the other hand, according to field theory, all changes are due to certain forces. There are two types of force which bring about change in cognitive structure - one resulting from the structure of the cognitive field itself, and the other from needs or motivations (valences) (p. 83).

5.0 Motivation Theory - competence through social approval.

Lewin's work was developed further by McClelland et al. (1953) whose theory of motivation postulated that "behaviour is determined by situational (perceptual) factors, by habit (memory) factors, and by motivational factors" (p. 42).

These motivational factors are based on affect rather than biological needs or strong stimuli because affect is so important in controlling behaviour, and because of "the overwhelming evidence for the importance of selective sensitivity in guiding and directing behaviour in lower animals" (p. 31). The claim is that certain types of situations (e.g. sensory or perceptual discrepancies from the adaptation level of the organism) innately release reactors which are diffuse and covert in man rather than

specific and overt (as in animals), but which are consummatory in the same sense in that they ultimately exhaust themselves. These diffuse reactions are what McClelland et al. mean by affect, and they can be observed either through verbal reports, and autonomic reactions, or inferred from approach and avoidance behaviour. McClelland differs strongly from behaviourists, in that he sets out to establish that affect accompanies motives and is not necessarily, nor exclusively the result of motives.

White (1959) also develops this theme of redefining motivation to include affect. He expresses discontent with the respectability accorded to the behaviourist and psychoanalytic pre-occupation with drives as the basis of motivation and he proposes a "competence" motive to account for an organism's capacity to interact effectively with its environment. His central argument is that the motivation needed to attain competence cannot be wholly derived from sources of energy currently conceptualised as drives or instincts because man's capacity to interact effectively is not present at birth and cannot be explained simply by maturation or fear. White claims that learning theory research has come to question the adequacy of the orthodox drive model and while competence (which includes exploration, activity, and manipulation) is different in some respects from hunger, thirst and sex, it is a primary rather than a secondary, source of motivation.

According to White, motivation persists in an ever more differentiated way and is most evident at times when the organism's survival needs are not demanding total energy. Like

McClelland, White proposes a feeling component of his concept of competence motivation - the feeling of satisfaction or efficacy.

The importance of the feeling aspect of motivation has been taken up in greater detail by other psychologists. For example, Sherif and Sherif (1964) claim that the degree of competence in mastering one's environment depends very much on the emotional attachments of the individual to a social group. A sense of belonging to a reference group, developed through social interaction, gives direction and purpose to the striving of an individual. According to Sherif and Sherif (1964):

> "Groups... are formed to do something about common deprivations, frustrations, and goals of individual members. They are formed to provide individual members with mutual support, a feeling of personal worth, a stable ground for self-identity, intimate social ties conducive to confidence among members chosen to be the "ins'" (p. 255).

This is the purpose of reference groups whether they conform or not to overall societal norms for acceptable behaviour. Individuals will therefore change their anti-social group membership if they are valued as useful members of more socially accepting groups, but the essential need for personal consistency in experience and behaviour, particularly for day-to-day continuity in the person's self-identity, must somehow be satisfied. The alternative is an absence of clear self-identity through absence of social ties, and this promotes experiences of estrangement and uncertainty accompanied by erratic and inconsistent behaviours. Sherif and Sherif (1965) go on to argue that if individuals are to change (attitudes, prejudices,

skills, etc.) then change programmes must recognise the influence of reference groups and involve participants in the initiation, development and execution of such programs so that their competence is acknowledged, usefulness is recognized, and their value as members of the group or community gives a sense of belonging. Once the perception of self (self concept) changes, then the evaluation of self (self- esteem) will change.

6.0 Implications for Schooling.

There are implications for schooling coming out of the work of the theorists outlined above. For example, if there is a strong innate need for mastery of the environment and this "mastery" takes place in the context of social groups, then the school as a social institution for learning, is of critical importance in terms of its curriculum content and process. The research on "school rebellion" (Polk 1969; and Pink 1982) teacher expectations (Brophy and Good 1973; Entwistle and Hayduck, 1981), and teacher-student interaction (Eder, 1981) could be interpreted in the light of motivation theory, to infer that school organisation and classroom climate are important for school commitment and academic attainment.

Some local research by Simkin (1983) adds weight to the case for the importance of school organisation in gaining student commitment through evaluation of the impact of decisions about issues such as streaming, and also about the role of extra-curricular activities such as sport, which can be as

effective as academic excellence as a source of commitment.

Simkin warns that the "locking out" process is related to structural differentiation within school procedures and also to the development of peer subcultures which develop around a combination of performance, course of study, and type of 'youth culture' orientation. Simkin concludes:

> Each school administration has the opportunity to influence the affective relations between its students, and the direction and strength of their commitments to success (p. 365).

Pearl and Riessman (1965) have also argued that the way school is organised can redirect early motivation for mastery and achievement, and consequently perpetuate social stratification according to class and race. Pearl (1972) proposes that if schooling is to develop the child's need for mastery and achievement, school curriculum must address the political and cultural context of our time. According to Pearl, this will develop competence to overcome the critical issues facing the world today - such as racism, war, poverty, pollution, and technological plunder of the earth's resources.

Pearl concludes that in order to do this the school must start from a conception of the child as a social being motivated to learn. The perception that the child has of itself is affected by reference groups, primarily family and peers, in the context of social institutions, especially the school, but also the wider context of society, including work. Pearl's solution to the inadequacy of schooling in meeting the child's need for mastery,

is to advocate a school curriculum that addresses the critical issues of our time. The logic of this for Pearl is that curriculum can link the innate need of students to explore the real world with the problems of human survival in the real world. This satisfies the cognitive aspect of learning. Pearl is also concerned with the affective element in learning. He argues the need not only for students to demonstrate competence but also the need to belong (to the school and other social institutions) and the need to feel useful, i.e. to make a contribution to the life of the institution to which they belong. This is experiential preparation for participation in the life of the wider community.

Another implication of social bond theory for schooling is that curriculum content needs to be clearly tied to the present and future world for students, and that this curriculum needs to be presented in a school context conducive to "commitment". Teacher attitudes and school organisation are critical contextual factors for student commitment, and this is supported by the work of Polk (1969), Pink (1982) and other researchers of "school climate".

A further implication for schooling is that the peer group is an

important source of teaching and learning. The peer group is also an agent of social bonding. Consequently, school curriculum and process that involves peer participation can strengthen social bonding. The school can strengthen social bonding processes further through interaction with families and with community organisations and activities. The network of social interactions is completed by connecting curriculum with the world of work in the present as well as in the expected future. This makes an on-going link between schooling and life career.

White (1959), McClelland (1953) and others have shown that teaching, which combines cognitive and affective components within a context of social interaction, maximises students' innate motivation for competence. Thus, students who are active in their own learning and have a sense of belonging to their school, will be motivated to demonstrate their competence. Implementation of social bond theory through active participation in school curriculum should therefore increase the connection of youth to conventional society and thereby decrease youth alienation.

The Victorian Minister for Education, in his Ministerial Paper No.6, recognises the central role of school curriculum in facilitating participation in society and reducing youth alienation. He states that:

> the central purpose of schooling is to prepare young people to enter fully into the life of their society (p.8).

The Minister goes on to clarify the role of curriculum in

achieving this purpose:

> The school's education policy should thus include a statement of the knowledge competencies and values which the school will seek to develop. The curriculum is the medium of achieving these goals (p.8).

The Minister outlines some fundamental expectations (p.12) of the Government for the types of knowledge, competencies and values that school curriculum should pursue so that young people might be able to:

a. participate effectively in the life of the multicultural society.

b. undertake worthwhile work.

c. play an active role in the processes through which our society is regulated and improved (p.12)

The Minister's paper does not detail how school curriculum may develop in ways that ensure a connection between knowledge, competencies and values and the subsequent full entry into the life of their society. This task will be attempted in this chapter in the light of the Malmsbury data. Such detail may be timely in that the recent Blackburn Report in Victoria (1985) is concerned with reducing youth alienation through increasing retention rates of students beyond the compulsory schooling age. Such a proposal may appear to be in the interests of Malmsbury youths because increased credentials may increase employability. However, Blackburn's proposal is to increase retention rates to 70% of the youth population by 1995. Nothing new is offered to the remaining 30% which would include the entire Malmsbury sample at present. While the Malmsbury study did not demonstrate conclusively that steady employment is linked to reduced

delinquency, it may be difficult for youth 'to enter fully into the life of their society' without access to work.

7.0 Implications for Curriculum Development at a Youth Training Centre

The major implication of social bond theory for curriculum at Malmsbury Youth Training Centre is that participation in social institutions needs to be developed or restored. The social institution for primary focus of training programs that connect this age group to conventional society, is work. The reason for emphasising the work connection here is that, as young adults, work becomes the critical social institution for connection to conventional society and entrance to future security. Other social connections throughfurther training, peers and family can also be strengthened as integral parts of the youth training centre curriculum, but it appears that Malmsbury training programs have no significant impact on employment status or number of weeks worked.

Financial independence, gained through work, can also permit a range of personal decision-making options about food, clothing, accommodation, leisure, etc.. Training programs leading to employment opportunities with increased status may also strengthen social ties and consequently reduce the potential for re-offending. Another suggestion relating to training program design is the

availability of, and access to, jobs for which the youth training centre provides training. For example, there seems little point in providing training for non-existent jobs. Analysis of labour market opportunities would ascertain employment trends. Data for this purpose is readily available from the Australian Bureau of Statistics, and the 'Age' newspaper has published (Feb. 22, 1985) employment trends in Australia over the past 85 years. The direction for the next 15 years is also predictable in that employment trends indicate that the community services sector has expanded from 9.2% of the labour force in 1901 to 34.5% in 1984, whereas agriculture, mining and manufacture are now in decline.

This suggests that training programs at Malmsbury could have a greater orientation towards white collar jobs in health, education, and welfare, in order to improve the chances of youths gaining work that has status and meaning.

Credentialling will be an obstacle to achievement of career goals, and will require co-operation of educational institutions outside the youth training centre. Teaching method also needs to be consistent with competence motivation theory, and the principle of learning-through-doing can be implemented by co-operative projects in which youths tutor each other and people outside the youth training centre, in skills leading to credentials.

While teaching at Malmsbury would employ the social enquiry method, some initial compromises may be necessary when negotiating with outside educational institutions not employing those methods because obtaining the credential is vital to the youth's future.

Changing the processes, by which those credentials are dispensed, is an obstacle to be addressed at a political level and overcome over a period of time, possibly in stages. A beginning could be made for example, by negotiating credits for cross-age tutoring work currently being undertaken by youths in some youth training centres. In addition to arranging credits for co-operative learning-through-doing activities, it would be necessary to implement a graduated career structure and this would require a re-orientation of education and work policies at government level.

The connection between schooling and work in Victoria is still not quite secure for young people. The Kirby Report, (1985) The Blackburn Report, (1985) and the Victorian Government's 'Youth Guarantee' scheme all take responsibility for work preparation but not for career development or for creating alternative paths to careers such as that proposed by the New Careers concept (Polk, 1984). Innovative schemes, even radical reforms to the school-work connection, are necessary in order to improve the life chances of Malmsbury youths. For example, State Wards probably have least to look forward to because their past separation from families and present employability difficulties have probably weakened ties to conventional society. Most want more schooling although previous schooling has generally not involved them or prepared them for the future.

Graduated entry into high status jobs in the service sector would enable youths to achieve short term goals, which cumulatively, would provide an alternative path to a career, with the option of stopping or continuing on at each stage of work and study. In the

field of education, youths could start by being paid tutors, then teachers assistants, and ultimately fully qualified teachers.

As detention in a youth training centre currently costs $800.00 per youth per week, the proposed orientation to curriculum development may ultimately be less costly, both financially and socially, through reduction of youth alienation generally, and juvenile delinquency in particular.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alexander, J.F. and Parsons, B.V. (June 1973) Short-Term Behavioural Intervention with Delinquent Families: Impact on Family Process and Recidivism, in Journal of Abnormal Psychology, pp.219-25.

Alston, J.G. (Fall 1981) The Role of the Community College in Instruction for the Incarcerated, in Community College Review, Vol. 9, No.2, pp.10-14.

American Institute of Research, April 1979) cited in Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Dept. of Justice, L.E.A.A., Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, pp.38-40.

Anderson, D.S. and Vervoon, A.E. (1983) Access to Privilege: Patterns of Participation in Australian Post-Secondary Education, A.N.U. Press, Canberra,

AREA STUDY TEAM REPORTS. (1980) Published from the School of Education, La Trobe University Bundoora, Melbourne.

No. 1 Primary School Innovation: A Case Study of Three Melbourne Schools.
No. 2 Primary School as a Learning Community.
No. 3 A New Way In: A Report on School Transition Programs.
No. 4 Programs For a Good Start.
No. 5 Extensions and Dimensions: Curriculum: Community: Transition.
No. 6 Education and Detained Youth.
No. 7 A Manual for the Writing Teacher.

Australian Bureau of Statistics, 1981 Census.

Australian Bureau of Statistics, (1984) Employment, Underemployment and Unemployment 1966-1983 Australia, Canberra, p.27.

Australian Bureau of Statistics, (1984) Social Indicators No. 4, Canberra, p.136.

Australian Bureau of Statistics. (1985) Social Indicators Victoria No. 1, Canberra.

Australian Electoral Office, (1983) Analysis of Attitudes Towards Enrolment and Voting, Australian Govt. Printer, Canberra.

Australian Government, (1975) Racial Discrimination Act.

Ball, E.R., Parker, L.G., and Saunders, J.C. (Winter 1982) Incarceration and the Rate of Achievement of Learning Disabled Juvenile Delinquents, in J.Experimental Education, Vol. 51, No.2.

Bandura, A. (1977) cited in Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Dept. of Justice, L.E.A.A., Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, p.94.

Barker Lunn, J.C. (1970) Streaming in the Primary School, King, Thorne and Stace, N.F.E.R. England and Wales, p.274.

Barton, W., and Sarri, R. (1979) Where are they now? A follow-up study of youth in juvenile correctional programs, in Crime and Delinquency, Vol. 25, No. 2., pp.162-176.

Bates, I. et al (1984) Schooling for the Dole?, Macmillan (Pitman), London.

Becker, N.S. (1963) Outsiders, N.Y., Free Press.

Bell, R. et al. (June 1979) Correctional Education Programs for Inmates: National Evaluation Program, Phase 1 Report, National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Department, Washington D.C.

Blackburn (1985) - see Minister of Education.

Bourdieu, P. (1974) The School as a Conservative Force: Scholastic, and Cultural Inequalities , in Eggleton, J. (ed), Contemporary Research in Sociology of Education, London, Methuen.

Bowles, S. and Gintis, H. (1976) Schooling in Capitalist America, Basic Books, N.Y.

Braithwaite, J. (1980) Prisons Education and Work, University of Queensland Press.

Brennan, M. and Brennan, R.E. (April 1984) Literacy and Learning: The Human Factor, Report to the Criminology Research Council of the Australian Institute of Criminology on the literacy needs and abilities of prison inmates.

Brookover, W.B. et al.,(April 1980) Changing School Climate, Urban Education, Vol. 15, No. 1, p.52.

Bruner, J. (1983) Education as Social Invention, Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 39, No. 4, pp.129-142.

Buttram, J. and Dusewicz, R. (1977) Effectiveness of Educational Programs in State Correctional Institutions: A Follow-up Study of Ex-Offenders, Research for Better Schools, Philadelphia.

C.T.E.C. (1982) Learning and Earning: A Study of Education and Employment Opportunities for Young People, Aust. Govt. Publishing Service, Canberra, Vol. 2, pp.180-1.

Carnoy, M. and Levin, H. (1985) Schooling and Work in the Democratic State, Stanford Uni. Press.

Challinger, D. (1977) Young Offenders, Vic. Assoc. Care and Rehabilitation of Offenders, Carlton.

Claydon, L., Knight, T. and Rado, M. (1977) Curriculum and Culture, Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

Cloward, R.A. and Ohlin, L.E. (1960) Delinquency and Opportunity: A

Theory of Delinquent Gangs, Glencoe, Free Press.

Cohen, A.K. (1955) Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang, N.Y.: Free Press.

Commission of Inquiry into Poverty. (1976) Poverty and Education in Australia (Fitzgerald Report), Fifth Main Report, Australian Govt. Printer, Canberra.

Commissioner for Community Relations, (1980) Fifth Annual Report, Aust. Govt. Printer, Canberra, p.87.

Committee of Inquiry into Education and Training (Williams Report), (1979) Commonwealth of Australia, Report on Education, Training and Employment, Vol. 1,

Commonwealth of Australia, (1976) First Annual Report, Commission for Community Relations, Aust. Govt. Printer, Canberra, p.9.

Commonwealth of Australia, (1977) Royal Commission on Human Relationships.

Commonwealth of Australia, (1980) Royal Commission of Inquiry into Drugs.

Commonwealth of Australia, (1985) Report of the Committee of Inquiry into Labour Market Programs, Aust. Govt. Publishing Service, Canberra.

Commonwealth Schools Commission, (1984) Funding Guidelines to the Commonwealth Education Commissions for 1984, Aust. Govt. Printer, Canberra.

Connell, R.W. et al. (1982) Making the Difference, Allen and Unwin, Sydney, p.120.

Connell, W.F. et al. (1975) 12 to 20: Studies of City Youth, Sons. Sydney, p 273.

Connelly, K. and Bruner, J. (eds) (1974) The Growth of Competence, Proceedings of a Developmental Sciences Trust Study Group, London, Academic Press.

Coventry, G., Cornish, G., Cooke, R., and Vinall, J. (1984) Skipping School: An Examination of Truancy in Victorian Secondary Schools, Research Section, V.I.S.E., Melbourne.

Davidson, W.S. and Seidman, E. (1978) Studies in Behaviour Modification and Juvenile Delinquency: A Review, Methodological Critique, and Social Perspective, in Krisberg, B. and Austin, J. (eds) The Children of Ishmael, Mayfield Publishing Co., Palo Alto, pp.433-450.

Daniel, A. (1983) Power, Privilege and Prestige: Occupations in Australia, Longman, Cheshire.

Day, S. (May 1979) Education and Training in the Criminal Justice System: Implications for Vocational Education, Discussion Paper No. 52, Ohio State Uni., Columbus.

Day, S.R. and McCane, M.R. (1982) Vocational Education in Corrections, Office of Vocational and Adult Education, Washingtron, D.C.

Dewey, J. (1916) Democracy and Education, N.Y.: Macmillan.

Diem, R.A. and Knoll, J.F. (Summer 1982) An Analysis of an Alternative Model of an Inmate Educational System, in Journal Offender Counselling Services and Rehabilitation, Vol. 6, No. 4, pp.83-93.

Dolan, L. (Oct 1978) The Affective Consequences of Home Support, Instructional Quality, and Achievement, Urban Education, Vol.XIII, No.3, pp.323-344.

Duncan, O.D. (1972) Socioeconomic Background and Achievement, Seminar Books, Ch.5.

Dwyer, P., Wilson, B. and Woock, R. (1984) Confronting School and Work, Allen and Unwin, Sydney.

Eder, D. (July 1981) 'Micro-Analysis of Teacher-Student Interaction' Sociology of Education, Vol. 54, pp.152-161.

Education Commission of the States, (1976) Education for the Youthful Offender in Correctional Institutions, in Overview of Findings and Recommendations of Major Research Studies, L.E.A.A., Dept. of Justice, Washington D.C.

Education Department of Victoria (1985) Curriculum Frameworks P-12, Govt. Printer.

Edwards, R. (1979) Contested Terrain, Basic Books, N.Y.

Elliott, D. Ageton, S.S. and Cantor, R.J. (Jan 1979) 'An Integrated Theoretical Perspective on Delinquent Behaviour', Research in Crime and Delinquency, pp.3-27.

Engel, B.S. (Aug 1984) 'Between Feelin and Fact: Listening to Children' Harward Educational Review, Vol. 54, No.3.

Entwisle, D.R. and Hayduck, L.A. (Jan 1981) 'Academic Expectations and the School Attainment of Young Children', Sociology of Education, Vo. 54, pp.34-50.

Entwistle, H. (1971) Political Education in a Democracy, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Finckenauer, J.O. (Aug 1979) Scared Crooked, in Psychology Today, pp.6-11.

Fraser, S.E. and Knight, T. (1981) Vietnam: Drug Rehabilitation: Whose Problem?, A.N.Z.J. Criminology, Vol. 14, p.139.

Friedman, A.H. and Bloom, R.B. (1980) Community College Faculty Attitudes Toward Correctional Inmates and Toward Teaching Off-Campus Courses at Correctional Institutions, Community/Junior College Research Quarterly, Vol. 5, pp.53-72.

Gallagher, M. (June 1979) 'The Restructuring of the Education System in Australia' Conference, Education and the Workforce, La Trobe Uni.

Gallagher, M. (June 1979) The Re-structuring of Education System in Australia, paper for Labor Resource Centre Conference, La Trobe Univ., Melbourne, p.51.

Galley, J.P. and Parsons, M.H. (October 1976) College Behind the Walls. Paper presented at the National Convention of the C7 College Science Association, Kansas, 1976.

Galton, F. (1983) Inquiry Into Human Faculty and its Development, Macmillan, London.

Gendreau, P. and Ross, R. (Oct 1979). Effective Correctional Treatment: Bibliotherapy for Cynics, in Crime and Delinquency, pp.463-489.

Gershuny, J.I. and Miles, I.D. (1983) The New Service Society, Frances Pinter Publishers, Lond..

Gersten, Langner, T.S. and Sincha-Fagan, O. (1978-79) Developmental Patterns of Types of Behavioural Disturbance and Secondary Prevention, in International Journal of Mental Health, Vol. 7.

Gibbons, D.C. (1970) Delinquent Behaviour, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, p.75.

Gilmour, P. and Lansbury, R. (1978) Ticket to Nowhere: Training and Work in Australia, Penguin, Australia.

Glueck, E. and S. (1952) Delinquents in the Making, N.Y., Harper and Row.

Gold, M. (Jan 1974) A Time for Skepticism, in Crime and Delinquency, pp 20 - 24.

Good, T.L. and Brophy, J.E. (1973) Looking in Classrooms, N.Y., Harper and Row, p.69.

Good, T.L., Biddle, B.J., and Brophy, J.E. (1975) Teachers Make a Difference, N.Y., Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Gould, S.J.(1981) The Mismeasure of Man, Penguin, London, 1981, p.24.

Grant, J. and Grant J.D. (1975) 'Evaluation and New Careers Programs, in M. Guttentag (ed), Handbook of Evaluation Research, Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues.

Grant, J.D. (1982) Individual Initiative and Experiential Learning, draft paper, Social Action Research Centre, California.

Greig, D.N. (1978) The Vulnerability of Young Offenders to School Disengagement: An Interactional Study of School Commitment and Delinquency. Paper presented at the Conference of the ANZ Sociological Association, University of Queensland, St. Lucia.

Griswold, D.B. (1978) A Comparison of Recidivisam Measures, Journal of Criminal Justice, Vol. 6, pp. 247-252.

Hallahan, D.P. and Kaufman, J.M. (1976) Introduction to Learning Disabilities, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, p.157.

Hargreaves, D.H., Hester, S.K., and Mellor, F.J. (1975) Deviance in Classrooms, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.

Henderson, R., et.al (1970) People in Poverty, Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research, Cheshire.

Henderson, R. (June 1985) Poverty: 10 Years On, in Australian Society, Vol.4, No.6.

Hess, R.D., and Torney, J.(1969) The Development of Political Attitudes in Children, Aldine Publishing Co., Chicago.

Hirschi, T.(1969) Causes of Delinquency, Berkeley: University of California Press, p.20.

Holdsworth, R. (ed.) Connect: Newsletter of Youth Participation in Education Projects, High Pollution Publishers, Brunswick, Melbourne.

Homant, R.J. and Osowski, G.(Mar 1982). The Politics of Juvenile Awareness and Programs: A Case Study of J.O.L.T., Criminal Justice and Behaviour, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp.55-68.

Howe, B. (June 1985) 'Wealth Report Backs Left', in Socialist Objective, Vol. 5, No.1, Moreland, Victoria.

Kassebaum, G. (1974) Delinquency and Social Policy, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, p.52.

Keesling, J.W. et al.(1979) Compensatory Education and Confined Youth, Systems Development Corp., Santa Monica, California, 1979.

Kemmis, S., Dawkins, D., Brown, L., Cramer, B., and Reilly, T.(1983) Transition and Reform in the Victorian Transition Education Program. T.E.A.C., Vic.

Kerle, K.(1974) Education-Penal Institutions: U.S. and Europe, Institute on Action Research and Justice Management, American University, Washington, D.C.

Kirby (1985) - see Commonwealth Inquiry into Labour Market Programs.

Kirk, S. and Gallagher, J. (1983) Educating Exceptional Children, 4th ed., Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Knight, T. (1985) 'Schools and Delinquency: Integration or Social Segregaton, Juvenile Delinquency in Australia, edited by A. Borowski and J. Murray, Methuen.

Knight, T. (Dec 1982) Youth Advocacy Report: A Student Initiated Project, Vandalism Task Force, Dept. of the Premier and Cabinet, Victoria, Australia.

Knight, T. (1975) "Locked In" or "Locked Out": the powerlessness of

the student role, in Claydon, L. (ed.) The Urban School, Melbourne, Pitman.

Leiter, J., (July 1983) 'Classroom Composition and Achievement Games', Sociology of Education, Vol. 56, pp.126-132.

Levin, H.M. (1980) Educational Opportunity and Social Inequality in Western Europe, in Benet, J. and Daniels, A.K. Education: Straitjacket or Opportunity, Transaction Books, N.J.

Lewin, K. (1951) Field Theory in Social Science: Selected Theoretical Paper, edited by D. Cartwright, Harper, Torch Book, N.Y. Ch.4.

Lougheed, J. (ed) et al.(1982) In Defence of Youth: Youth Advocacy in Action, Department of Education, Washington, D.C.

Malmsbury Youth Training Centre (1983) Philosophy, Goals and Objectives. Dept. for Community Services' Document.

Marshall, et al. (eds) (1976) Education Commission of the States, Evaluation of Newgate and other Prisoner Education Programs in Overview of Findings and Recommendations of Major Research Studies, L.E.A.A., Washington, D.C.

Martin, J., Veldman, D., and Anderson, L.,(Winter 1980) 'Within Class Relationships between student achievement and teacher behaviours, American Educational Research Journal, Vol. 178, No. 4, pp.479-490.

Martinson, R., (1974) What Works?, in The Public Interest, Vol 35, pp 22 - 54.

Martinson, R., Lipton, D., and Wilks, J. (1975) The Effectiveness of Correctional Treatment, Praeber Publishers, N.Y.

Martinson, R., Palmer, T., and Adams, S., (1976) Rehabilitation, Recidivism and Research, National Council on Crime and Delinquency, New Jersey.

Matza, D. (1964) Delinquency and Drift, Wiley & Sons, Inc., N.Y.

McClelland, D.C., Atkinson, J.W., Clark, R.A., and Lowell, E.L.,(1953) The Achievement Motive, Appleton Century Crofts, N.Y., p.42.

McCollum, S.G. (June 1977) What Works! Federal Probation, pp.32-35.

McCord, J.(March 1978) 'A Thirty-Year Follow-up of Treatment Effects", American Psychologist.

McCord, J. and McCord, W. (1959) 'A Follow-up Report on the Cambridge-Somerville Youth Study, Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, N. 322, pp.89-96.

McCord, W. and McCord, J. (Mar 1978) A Thirty-year Follow-up Study of Treatment Effects, in American Psychologist, pp.284-9.

McCoy, A.W. (1980) Drug Traffic, Harper and Row, Sydney, p.22.

Merton, R. (1959) Social Structure and Anomie, American Sociological Review, Vol. 24, No. 3, pp.678-682.

Miller, W.B. (1958) Lower Class Culture as a Generating Milieu of Gang Delinquency, J. Social Issues, Vol. 14, No. 3, pp.5-19.

Minister of Education, (1984) Curriculum Development and Planning in Victoria, Ministerial Paper No.6, Vic.Ed.Dept.

Minister of Education (1985) Review of Post-compulsory Schooling, Vic. Ed. Dept.

Montagu, A. (ed.) (1980) Sociobiology Examined, Oxford Uni. Press, N.Y., p.251.

Morin, L. (1981) On Prison Education, Canadian Government Publishing Centre,

Murray, C. (1976) The Link Between Learning Disabilities and Juvenile Delinquency: Current Theory and Knowledge. Executive Summary, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Dept. of Justice.

Nisbett, R.A. (1970) The Nature of Social Bond, Alfred A. Knopf, N.Y.

Nye, F.E., Short, J.F., Jr. and Olson, V.J. (1966) Socioeconomic Status and Delinquent Behaviour, Ch. 17 in R. Giollombardo (ed.) Juvenile Delinquency: A Book of Readings, Jn. Wiley & Sons, N.Y.

Nye, F.I. (1975) Family Relationships and Delinquent Behaviour, N.Y., John Wiley and Sons.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (1977) Educational Policy and Planning: Transition from School to Work and Further Study, Paris.

Palmer, T. (1974) The Community Treatment Project in Perspective: 1961-1973, in Youth Authority Quarterly, California Office of State Printing.

Parlett, (1980) T.A.A. Education - A Necessary if not Sufficient Modality in the Correction of Penitentiary Inmates, Learning, Vol. 3., No. 2. pp.34-38.

Patterson, G.R. (Aug 1974) Interventions for Boys with Conduct Problems: Multiple Settings, Treatment and Criteria, in Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, pp.471-81.

Pearl, A. (1972) The Atrocity of Education, New Critics Press, Missouri,

Pearl, A., and Riessman, F. (1965) New Careers for the Poor: The Non-Professional in Human Service, Free Press, N.Y.

Pearl, A. et al (1978) The Value of Youth, Responsible Action Press, California.

People in Poverty: A Melbourne Survey (1970) (Henderson Report), Melb., Cheshire.

Petrie, S.(Feb 1984) Schools, Delinquency and Alienation, in Proceedings of the Australian Crime Prevention Council Twelfth Bi-Ennial Conference, ACPC Journal, Vo. 6, No. 4, pp.79-85.

Pfannenstiel, J.C. and Hoyt, J.C. (1979) Post Release Experiences of Students from State Correctional Institutions, System Development Corp., Santa Monica, California.

Piaget, J.(1952) The Origins of Intelligence in Children, N.Y., International Universities Press.

Pink, W. (1982) 'Academic Failure, Student Social and Conflict, and Delinquent Behaviour, Urban Review, Vol. 14, No. 3.

Pink, W. (April 1982) School Effects, Academic Performance and School Crime, Urban Education, Vol. 17, No. 1.

Pink, W., (1978) 'Rebellion and Success in High School', Contemporary Education, No. XLIX, pp.78-84.

Polk, K. (1969) Class, 'Strain and Rebellion Among Adolescents', Social Problems, No. 17, pp.214-223.

Polk. K., et al. (1982) Marion County Youth Study: A Sixteen Year Follow-up Study, Unpublished, Dept. of Sociology, Uni. of Oregan.

Polk, K. (June 1984) Wanted: New Career Paths, Australian Society, Vol. 3, No. 6, pp.18-21.

Polk, K. (July 1984) New Marginal Youth, Crime and Delinquency.

Polk, K. (Oct 1984) Juvenile Diversion: A Look at the Record, in Crime and Delinquency, Vol. 30, No. 4, pp.648-659.

Polk, K. (Nov 1984) Post Industrialism and the New Youth Marginality, Australian Educational Researcher, Aust. Assoc.. for Research in Educ., Vol. II, No. 4, p.28.

Polk, K. (Nov 1984) Post-Industrialism and the New Youth Marginality, Australian Educational Research, Vol. 11, No. 4.

Rice, I. (1980) Assessment of Quality Vocational Education in State Prisons. Paper presented at the American Education Research Association Annual Meeting, Boston.

Riessman, F. and Popper, H.I. (eds) (1968) Up From Poverty, Harper and Row, N.Y.

Rogers, C.R. (1969) Freedom to Learn, Ohio: Merrill.

Rokeach, M. (1973) The Nature of Human Values, McMillan, N.Y.

Rosenthal, R. and Jacobsen, L.(1968) Pygmalion in the Classroom, N.Y., Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Rossi, P.H., Berk, R.A. and Lenihan, K.J. (1978) Money, Work and Crime: Experimental Evidence, Academic Press, N.Y.

Rutter, M. (1983) School Effects on Pupil Progress: Research Findings and Policy Implications, Child Development, 54, 1 - 29.

Rutter, M. et al. (1979) Fifteen Thousand Hours, Open Books, London, p.205.

Sanders, W.B. (1976) Juvenile Delilnquency, N.Y., Fraeger.

Sarri, R. (1981) The Effectiveness Paradox, in Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 37, No. 3, pp.34-50.

Schaeffer, E.R. and Shannon, T.P. (1983) A Follow-up Study of Vocational Education Graduates from the Ohio Central School System during Fiscal Year 1979, Research Report.

Shaw, R. and McKay, H.D. (1931) Social Factors in Juvenile Delinquency, Wickersham Commission, U.S. Govt. Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

Sherer, M. (March 1983) The Incarceration Period and Educational Achievement of Juvenile Delinquents, in Criminal Justice and Behaviour, Vol. 10, No.1, pp.109-20.

Sherif, M. and Sherif, C. (1965) Attitude and Attitude Change, W.G. Saunders & Co., Phil.

Sherif, M., and Sherif, C. (1964) Reference Groups, Harper and Row.

Simkin, K. (1983) Peer Groups, School Environments and Students' Commitment to Success in Secondary School, in Browne, R.K. and Foster, L.E. (eds) Sociology of Education, 3rd Ed., McMillan Aust.

Spearman, C. (1923) The Nature of Intelligence and the Principles of Cognition, Macmillan, London.

Stinchcombe, A. (1964) Rebellion in a High School, Quadrangle Books, Chicago.

Stricker, P. and Sheehan, P. (1978) Youth Unemployment: A Survey, Australian Economic Review, Vol. 3.

Syracuse University Study, (1973) School Behind Bars: A Descriptive Overview of Correctional Education in the American Prison System.

TASK FORCE OCCASIONAL PAPERS
No. 1BGHS: A Report upon a School Explosion
No. 2 The Creation of a Creche in a High School.
No. 3 Cross-Age Tutoring: A Means of Increasing Motivation.
No. 4A Case Study of the Cross-Age Tutoring Programs.
No. 5A Careers Re-entry Program.

Task Force Report Seven, (1982) A School Curriculum and Self-Evaluation Project, La Trobe Univ. School of Education, Victoria.

TASK FORCE REPORTS. Published from the School of Education, La Trobe University, Bundoora, Melbourne.

No. 5 School and Work: An Exploration.
No. 6 TAFE: The Rhetoric and the Reality.
No. 7 A School Curriculum and Self-Evaluation Project.
No. 8 Student Retention Rates: A Case Study in TAFE.
No. 9 An Investigation into Objective Learning.

Taylor, A. (September 1974) Beyond Rehabilitation: The Federal City College Lorton Project, in J.Negro Education, Vol. 43, No. 2, pp.172-78.

Thelen, H. (1960) Education and the Human Quest, N.Y.: Harper and Row.

Thrasher, F.M. (1927) The Gang, University of Chicago Press.

Toch, H., and Grant, J.D. (1983) Reform in Human Services: Change Through Participation, Beverley Hills: Sage Publications.

Towan, B. and Miracle, A.W. (July 1983) 'Systems of Ability Grouping and the Stratification of Achievement in Elementary Schools, Sociology of Education, Vol. 56, pp. 133-144.

Tremblay, R.E. (Oct 1984) Treatment of Hard-Core Delinquents in Residential Establishments, Brit.J.Criminology, Vol. 24, No. 4, pp.384-393.

U.S. Department of Education, (1980) Teacher Corps Youth Advocacy: Training Resource Manual, Washington, D.C.

U.S. National Institute of Justice, (Aug 1982) Program Announcement, Washington, D.C.

U.S. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, (1979) City Life and Delinquency: Victimisation, Fear of Crime and Gang Membership, cited in Delinquency Prevention, Washington, D.C. p.88.

Victorian Dept. for Community Welfare Services (1983), Recidivism Patterns Among Youth Trainees.

Weathers, L. and Lieberman, R.P. (May 1975) Contingency Contracting with Families of Delinquent Adolescents, in Behaviour and Therapy, pp.356-66.

West, D.J. and Farrington, D.P. (1973) Who Becomes Delinquent? London, Heinemann.

Wheelwright, E.D. (Sept 1980) 'World Capitalism, Education and the Common People', ACTU Conference, Education and the 80's, Melbourne.

Wheelwright, E.L. (Sept 1980) World Capitalism, Education and the Common People, Keynote address to A.C.T.U. conference "Education and the 80's", Melbourne, p.12.

White, J. (1982) The Aims of Education Re-Stated, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.

White, R.W. (1959) 'Motivation Reconsidered: The Concept of

Competence', Psychology Review, Vol. 66, No. 5.

Whitehead, A.N. (1932) The Aims of Education, Williams and Norgate, England.

Willis, P. (1977) Learning to Labour, Saxon House, England.

Willis, P. (1984) - See Bates, I.

Windshuttle, K. Unemployment, op.cit. Ch.11.

Windshuttle, K. (1979) Unemployment, Penguin, Australia, p.237.

Wolf, J.G. and Sylves, D. (1981) The Impact of Higher Education Opportunity Programs: Post-prison Experience of Disadvantaged Students, N.Y. State Education Department, Albany.

Wright, W.E. and Dixon, M.C. (Jan 1977) Community Prevention and Treatment of Juvenile Delinquency, Journal Research in Crime and Delinquency.

Wyman, B.T. (1975) Certain Strategies for Prison Classes Sponsored by Community Colleges, Ed.D.Practicum, Nova University.

APPENDIX ONE

INITIAL INTERVIEW MATERIAL

Melbourne State College of Advanced Education

757 Swanston Street
Carlton Victoria, 3053, Australia

Department of Special Education
Telephone 341 8392
341 8363

WHAT'S HAPPENING OUT THERE?

I am a researcher from Melbourne C.A.E. and over the next year or so I will be trying to answer the question of what is happening out there. To do this, I will need your help.

The idea is that I will interview trainees three times - as their program begins, just before they leave Malmsbury and then 6 months later.

I want to know whether what happens in the Y.T.C. is useful to trainees when they go back into the community. If so, how? If not, why not?

Apart from the interviews, I may want to read your Community Welfare file and your police file to check out questions like: Is it easier or harder to get a job for someone who has a long list of priors?

Whatever information I collect from you or your files will not be passed on to anyone else - not even the Y.T.C. Your information, and that of all other trainees, will be put together to see whether there are common problems faced by ex-trainees. Then recommendations will be made about how these problems could be handled.

When the research is finished all information will be destroyed.

You do not have to take part in the research project and any benefits that come from it will most likely help future trainees.

However, you are encouraged to take part. It won't take much of your time and I will sign a statement that says your participation is completely confidential,

You will have a copy of this statement nd if you or your parents want to ask questions about the research you can contact me when I am at the Y.T.C. or at work on Melbourne 341 8584.

Yours sincerely,

[illegible] SEMMENS

Name : _____

PRE-PROGRAM INTERVIEW

School and Work History

What level did you reach at school?	
How old were you when you left school?	
Why did you leave then? _____	
Given a gree choice, what level would you like to reach?	
What level do you think you will reach?	

Work

During the last six months:

How many weeks have you worked?	
What job(s) have you had? _____	
What were your average wages? _____	
How did you go about getting jobs? _____	
How did you leave your job(s)? _____	
What programs are you expecting to do at Malmsbury? Why? _____	

CONSENT FORM

I agree to participate in the evaluation of Malmsbury Y.T.C. programs.

This agreement will involve me in the following tasks:

1. Early in my time at Malmsbury Y.T.C. I will complete a questionnaire and a brief interview about my schooling and work history.

2. At the end of my time at Malmsbury I will complete a questionnaire and a brief interview about my program at Malmsbury.

3. Six months after release I will complete a questionnaire and a brief interview about the value of my program to me since leaving Malmsbury. There will be a small payment to me for keeping this appointment with Mr. R. Semmens or one of his colleagues at an agreed time and place.

In consenting to participate in this evaluation, I agree to Mr. R. Semmens having access to my Community Welfare and Police Department files provided that he does not use my name or any personally identifying data in any written report or public statement he makes about the research. I further understand that he will securely store all notes and destroy them immediately upon completion of the research.

Signed

(Trainee) _____

(Researcher) _____

APPENDIX TWO

POST-PROGRAM INTERVIEW

POST-PROGRAM INTERVIEW

Name: _____ Forwarding Address: _____

_____

General Evaluation

1. What program(s) were you involved whilst here at Malmsbury?

   How come?

2. What sort of things have you been taught that will be most useful to you after release?

3. What would you have liked to have been taught more about?

4. What will your training here lead to after release?
   Further training/employment?

5. What work would you really like to do if you had a free choice?

6. What work do you expect to be doing 2 years from now?

APPENDIX THREE

SOCIAL AWARENESS INTERVIEW

SOCIAL AWARENESS INTERVIEW

Name
Age
Level
Sex M

Work =
Decis. =
Cult. =
Soc. =
Total =

At school/Malmsbury you were taught:

1. About the world of work? (Hours, benefits, unions, tax, etc.) Yes/No

   What? _____

   _____

   How? Speakers
   Films
   Discussions
   Individual teachers
   Careers teacher
   Excursions
   Work experience program
   Library
   Don't remember
   No information

2. How to cope if you are unemployed? Yes/No
   (Probe with financially, accommodation, training schemes, mental strains, friends).

   What? _____

   _____

   How? _____

   _____

3a. To write a job application? Yes/No

   What? _____

   _____

   How? _____

3b. To write an application for unemployment benefit (dole)? Yes/No

   What? _____

   _____

   How? _____

   _____

4. How to have a say in the way the school/training centre was run? Yes/No

What? _____

_____

How ? _____

5. How laws are made in Australia? Yes/No

What? _____

_____

How? _____

6. How to vote at elections? Yes/No

What? _____

_____

How? _____

7. About changes in Australia as a result of migrants coming here? (Food, language, dress, art, industry, etc.) Yes/No

What? _____

From whom? _____

8. The history, language, and way of life of the different nationalities of other students? Yes/No

What? _____

_____

How? _____

_____

9. How to participate in community activities for people who are different from yourself? (e.g. with the aged, disabled, child-care centre, etc.) Yes/No

What? _____

_____

How? _____

_____

At school/Malmsbury

10a. Did you take part in optional activities outside the classroom e.g. camps, sports, clubs, SRC, etc.) that were offered? Yes/No

Why? _____

10b. Were there enough optional activities to satisfy your interests? Yes/No

What? _____

11a. Did you feel that you were a useful member of the school/ training centre? Yes/No

Why _____

_____

11b. Did you have skills that were not recognized by the school/ training centre? Yes/No

What? (e.g. speaks two languages, etc.)

_____

_____

12. The bull's eye represents the activities that go on in the school. The centre is the middle of the things that go on.

a. How far from the centre of these activities were you?
b. How far from the centre were your closest friends?

13a. How well did you get along with other students/trainees generally (i.e. apart from your closest friends)?

Very well . . . . . Very poor
+2 +1 0 -1 -2

b. How well did you get along with teachers/instructors?

Very well . . . . . Very poor
+2 +1 0 -1 -2

c. How good was school/training centre as a place to be?

Very good . . . . . Very poor
+2 +1 0 -1 -2

d. How good was school/training centre at preparing you for life outside?

Very good . . . . . Very poor
+2 +1 0 -1 -2

e. How well did your friends do at school/training centre?

Very well . . . . . Very poor
+2 +1 0 -1 -2

APPENDIX FOUR

SOCIAL AWARENESS SURVEY IN ELEVEN VICTORIAN POST-PRIMARY SCHOOLS, 1984

REPORT OF SOCIAL AWARENESS SURVEY IN ELEVEN VICTORIAN POST-PRIMARY SCHOOLS

The social awareness interview, developed as part of a research project at Malmsbury Youth Training Centre, has now been administered by research students in the Graduate Diploma in Special Education at Melbourne C.A.E. to random samples of post-primary students in various parts of the metropolitan area and in country areas. The Malmsbury youths have also attended schools throughout the State at some time in their past.

Eleven research students each interviewed 10 students and scored the responses. These scores have now been collated and compared with 165 interviews carried out at Malmsbury Youth Training Centre. These interviews were completed over a 13-month period and include all youths admitted to Malmsbury except for a small number who had sentences of less than 3 months and a further 5 youths who did not want to be interviewed.

Summarised, the results are as follows in Table 1:

Table 1: Comparison of Mean Scores by Area on the Social Awareness Interview

Interview Area	Malmsbury Mean.	Post-Primary Mean.
Work	1.0	1.3
Decision-making	1.0	1.6
Cultural Connection	0.3	2.1
Social Relationships	3.0	3.3
Total	5.8	8.3

Given that the possible score in each area of the interview is 6, making the overall total 24, the outcome indicates that social awareness, as conceived by the interview, is not a major aspect of school curriculum in Victoria.

No tests of significance have been carried out on the results, partly because the most significant finding is the low overall outcome, but also because there are some important differences between the two groups, which may interfere with direct comparability of the two groups. The major differences are:

1. The Malmsbury group responded to the interview in retrospect. Some had left school more than five years ago and others fairly recently, but the post-primary group are still attending school.

.../2

2. The post-primary group consists of 52 boys and 58 girls whereas the Malmsbury group is entirely male. It is not known whether this factor would have a differential effect on responses. However, the mean overall score for the post-primary boys is 7.3, whereas the mean overall score for the entire post-primary group is 8.3.

3. There is a difference in age between the two groups. The mean age for Malmsbury youths is 18.4 years and the mean age for the post-primary group is 15.2 years.

4. The level of schooling attained differs in some respects between the two groups. The post-primary group was directed to restrict sampling to years 8 to 11 because this is the schooling range of the majority of Malmsbury youths. However, the Malmsbury group does include 4 youths who did not complete primary school, 9 youths who reached year 7, and 4 youths who reached year 12. Taken as a whole, the Malmsbury group includes 107 who did not reach year 10, and 58 who reached year 10 or above. That is, 65% did not reach year 10.

   The post-primary group includes 53 students who have not reached year 10 and 57 who are studying at year 10 or 11 level. The proportions are 48% and 52%, respectively.

   It is therefore possible that the outcome of the social awareness interview could have been affected by the larger proportion of the post-primary group studying at a higher level than the Malmsbury group.

Conclusions

1. Despite the possible sources of differences in outcome of scores between the two groups, the scores do suggest that even if the areas of the interview are taught or seen as important to schools, somehow students are not perceiving that they have been taught much in any of the areas.

2. The trends are similar between the two groups with apparent heaviest emphasis on social relationships teaching for both groups. The major difference between the two groups appears to be in the area of cultural connection where post-primary scores tend to be higher than the Malmsbury scores.
3. Another point of difference which may be worthy of further investigation is the relative proportions of respondents who answer in the affirmative to the question: Were you a useful member of the school? The Malmsbury youths tend to be heavily in the negative.

   Such an investigation might be oriented towards delinquency prevention and/or devising school curriculum that seeks to involve all students in the life of the school through participation in programs that have a direct relationship to work preparation, school governance, and cultural connection. If schools are best in the social relationships area, how can the best aspects of excursions, school camps, sport, and hobby groups be allowed to permeate the so-called "academic aspects of school curriculum?

4. The following is a letter from one of the Melbourne CAE research students:

> "For the past 12 years I have been involved with Primary Schools and consequently have little knowledge of the Secondary System. It wasn't until I actually scored the interview that I realised the significance of the questions and the general theme. If the results of my part of the study are duplicated in the rest of the study it would seem that students are very badly catered for when they enter the real world of work and community life. I hope my study is one of isolation. I enjoyed the study for one major reason, that is, that as yet, it is the only aspect of the GRAD. DIP. (in Special Education) that relates to the real world. I would like to see more of this kind of work built into the course, for what it's worth, you have my support."

APPENDIX FIVE

ALIENATION SCALE

NAME _____

PEOPLE AND WORK SCALE

The statements below reflects some opinions about people, work and the workplace.

There are four possible ways of responding to each statement - strongly agree, agree, disagree and strongly disagree.

Place a tick in the box that corresponds most closely to what you think now.

There is no time limit: just move through the items as quickly as you can, without missing any items.

Your response will not be discussed with Y.T.C. staff.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Why try to decide on a job when the future is so uncertain.				
2. Most people aren't really interested in their work.				
3. It doesn't matter which job you choose so long as it pays well.				
4. There is not much chance that people will really do anything to make this country a better place to live in.				
5. I would play in the same team as someone with skin colour different from mine.				
6. I'm not going to worry about choosing an occupation until I'm out of this place.				
7. I would find it hard to tell whether my work pleased the boss.				
8. A worker feels more useful when his ideas are listened to by the management.				
9. It's possible that I could have as best friend someone whose skin colour is different from mine.				
10. What the worker thinks is unimportant so long as he is doing his job well.				
11. There isn't much of a chance for a person like me to succeed in life.				
12. Luck decides most things that happen to me.				
13. I really can't find any work that appeals to me.				
14. It takes me a long time to get used to something new.				

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
15. I feel that other workers would not understand me.				
16. I would like a job where my boss is hardly ever around.				
17. It's who you know, not what you know, that is important in choosing a job.				
18. It's possible that I could have as best friend a person whose religion is different from mine.				
19. You get into an occupation mostly by chance.				
20. I would play in the same team as a person whose religion is different from mine.				
21. It's possible that I could have as best friend a person whose nationality is different from my own.				
22. Bosses usually blame their mistakes on the workers under them.				
23. I would play in the same team as a person whose nationality is different from my own.				
24. I would object to working alongside a person whose nationality is different from mine.				
25. People don't seem to understand my way of doing things.				
26. Why worry about choosing a job if you don't have any say in it.				
27. I would object to working alongside a person whose religion is different from mine.				
28. While I am working I often worry whether I am doing things right.				
29. I would be nervous if I knew the boss was watching my work.				
30. I would object to working alongside a person whose skin colour is different from mine.				
31. I seldom think about the job I want to enter.				
32. I get upset when I make a small mistake.				
33. I feel like giving up quickly when things go wrong.				

APPENDIX SIX

DANIEL EMPLOYMENT RANKING SCALE

DANIEL EMPLOYMENT RANKING SCALE

1. Judge
2. Cabiner Minister
   Medical specialist
3. Barrister
4. Church leader
   General Practitioner (medical)
   Managing director of large company
   University professor
5. General (Army)
6. International airline pilot
7. General manager of large firm
8. Architect
   Government department head
   Stipendiary magistrate
9. Dentist
   Finance manager of large firm
   Mayor
10. Engineer
    Parliamentarian
    Research scientist
    Solicitor (male)
11. Actuary
    Bank manager
    Solicitor (female)
12. Auditor
    Chartered accountant
    Economist
    Government medical officer
    Sales/marketing manager of large firm
    University lecturer
    Veterinary surgeon
13. Colonel (Army)
    Geologist
    Government lawyer
    Owner of large business
    Psychologist
    School Principal
14. Director of nursing services
    General manager of medium-sized firm
    Newspaper editor
    Orchestra conductor
15. Accountant
    Minister of religion (own parish)
    Town planner
16. Pharmacist
    TV program producer
17. Grazier/owner of large firm
    Optometrist
    TAFE lecturer
18. Management consultant
    Physiotherapist
    Surveyor
19. Master builder
    Second division officer, public service
    Stockbroker
    Works manager of large enterprise
20. Computer programmer
    Journalist
    Sales/marketing manager of medium-sized firm
    Systems analyst
    Superior of religious order
21. Chiropractor
    Health inspector
    Playwright
    Speech therapist
    Social worker
22. Dietitian
    Electrician (own business)
    Kindergarten directress
    Media newsreader
    Occupational therapist
    Secondary school teacher
23. General manager of small firm
    Industrial officer
    Personnel officer
    Private secretary to executive
    Professional fisherman (own boat)
    Restaurateur
    TV actor
24. Draftsman
    Librarian
    Primary school teacher
    Registered nurse (female)
    Technical officer
25. Air traffic controller
    Bank officer
    Clerk of courts
    Owner of small business
    Professional model

26. Ambulanceman
Air hostess
Building contractor
Chef
Factory manager
Infant school teacher
Laboratory technician
Publican
Registered nurse (male)
Research officer
Sales/marketing manager of small firm

27. Acupuncturist
Farm manager
Interior designer
Police detective
Pop singer
Professional footballer
Public relations officer

28. Advertising agent
Cabinet maker
Industrial foreman
Pre-school teacher
Professional golfer
Small rural landowner
Real estate agent

29. Carpenter
Contract cleaner (own business)
Photographer
Plumber
Policeman
Trade union secretary

30. Airline steward
Buyer (wholesale/retail)
Dental technician
Disc jockey. Fireman
Policewoman
Senior clerk/administrative officer
TV technician

31. Electrician (wages)
Jockey
Racehorse trainer
Stenographer

32. Bank teller
Beauty consultant : Housewife
Insurance agent
Receptionist
Travel agent

33. Army sargeant (male)
Bar manager
Motor mechanic
Tool maker

34. Army sargeant (female)
Bookkeeper/cost clerk
Fitrer and turner
Hairdresser
Telephone technician
Undertaker
Youth worker

35. Commercial traveller/ sales representative
Printer (wages)
Typist
Signwriter

36. Bookmaker
Potter

37. Punch card operator
Telephonist

38. Bricklayer : Butcher
Milkman

39. Chauffeur
Plasterer (wages)
Waiter

40. Car salesman
Nightwatchman (security officer)
Oil driller
Sailor (able seaman)
Shearer : Taxi driver : Waitress

41. Nursing aide
Postman
Train driver

42. Bus driver
Clerk (junior)
Housekeeper
Professional punter
Sales assistant
Storeman and packer
Truck driver

43. Tram driver

44. Barman
Gardener assistant

45. Clerical assistant
Jackaroo
Service station attendant
Wharfie
Fishing boat hand

46. Barmaid
Domestic worker
Machinist
Stripper
Ticket collector

47. Seasonal laborer
48. Car assembly worker
    Debt collector
49. Farm laborer
    Road sweeper
50. Builder's laborer
    Process worker
51. Lift driver
52. Cleaner
    Massage parlor operator
53. Garbage collector
54. Prostitute/streetwalker

APPENDIX SEVEN

TROUBLE INDEX

TROUBLE INDEX

This Index is a way of summarising data about "trouble" so that a comparison can be made between youths with differing levels of trouble and their respective post-program outcomes. For example, is a high trouble index a predictive factor for future regardless of program participation?

It is composed of three factors - frequency of offence, seriousness of offence, and seriousness of disposition.

1. Frequency of offence. This refers to the number of counts of each category of offence. For example, 3 counts of car theft and 2 counts of housebreaking would be used to multiply the scale number for seriousness of offence.

2. Seriousness of offence. The Victorian Crimes Act was the reference point in distinguishing between less serious offences (misdemeanors) and more serious offences (felonies) and for ranking offences on an eight-point "seriousness" scale.

Level	Maximum Penalty	Examples
1	Not more than 1 year in prison	Attempt steal motor car; Possession of drug of addiction; Unlicensed driving; Unlawfully on premises.
2	Not more than 2 years in prison	Assault;
3	Not more than 5 years in prison	Malicious wounding; Accessory to felony; Abduction; Assault O.A.B.H.; Indecent assault; Attempt rape; Attempt burglary; Wilful damage.
4	Not more than 7 years in prison	Grievous bodily harm;
5	Not more than 10 years in prison	Rape; Car theft; Deception; Arson; Criminal damage to property; Trafficking in drugs; Attempt robbery; Forgery; Receiving
6	Not more than 15 years in prison	Shooting with intent to harm; Manslaughter; Burglary; Handling stolen goods; Preparation and trafficking in drugs;
7	Not more than 20 years in prison	Robbery; Aggravated burglary; Lethal damage; Aggravated rape; Kidnapping; Attempt armed robbery
8	Not more than 25 years in prison	Armed robbery;

3. Seriousness of disposition. Possible decisions of the court are ranked from 1 to 8.

Level	Seriousness of Disposition
1	Non-detention penalty
2	Sentence of up to 6 months.
3	Sentence of 7 to 12 months.
4	Sentence of 13 to 18 months.
5	Sentence of 19 to 24 months.
6	Sentence of 25 to 30 months.
7	Sentence of 31 to 36 months.
8	Sentence of 37 to 48 months.

APPENDIX EIGHT

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE

Name : _____

Follow-Up Questionnaire

Section A - Work

1a. Are you working at present? Yes/No

b. What is your job? _____

c. What do you do at your job? _____

_____

2. Did you get a job before your release? Yes/No

3. How many jobs have you had since your release date? _____

4. How many weeks have you worked in the six months since your release date? _____

5. What has been your average take-home pay per week? _____

6. Have you been turned down for any jobs? Yes/No

If yes, tick all of the reasons that apply to you:

_____	criminal record	_____	sex
_____	unqualified	_____	poor references
_____	no openings	_____	health
_____	age	_____	no experience

7. How did you go about getting your job(s)? (Tick all that apply)

_____	Newspaper	_____	Friend	_____	Parole Officer
_____	C.E.S.	_____	Relative	_____	Past Employer
_____	Workout		Other (Specify)	_____	

8. If you had your choice, what work would you really like to do?

_____

9a Have you enrolled for any education/trade training courses since your release?

If yes, what? _____

where? _____

9b. How do you see your future in relation to:

further training _____

_____

employment _____

_____

If you have worked since your release please answer questions 10 - 11.
If not, then move on to Section B.

---

10. In any job(s) since your release date, did your employer provide any on-the-job training?
(Write down the name of the job and the sort of training provided.)

Job	Training provided on-the-job
1. _____	_____
2. _____	_____
3. _____	_____

11. a. What do you like most about your present job?

_____

b. What do you like least about your present job?

_____

c. Are you satisfied with your present job? Why or why not?

_____

_____

_____

d. Have you learned new work skills in your job(s) since release?

What? _____

_____

_____

e. Are you looking for another job at present? If yes, why?

_____

_____

Section B - Malmsbury

12. In what ways has your Malmsbury training been used since your release? (Tick all that apply).

Tick	Training	How Used
	Getting a job	
	Job skills (say what)	
	Reading and writing	
	Training course in a particular area of interest (maths, pottery, leather-work, driver ed., etc.) Name of courses	
	Staying out of trouble skills (say what)	
	Getting along with others	
	Personal controls: anger alcohol/drugs swearing other	
	Any other training?	
	And?	
	And?	

13a From your experience since leaving Malmsbury rate how important is it that Malmsbury should teach the skills shown below: (mark with a cross on each line)

Skill 1 - training that prepares trainees for good jobs e.g. trade trainin

Very Important	Important	Not Important	Quite Unimportant

Give a reason for this rating: _____

_____

Skill 2 - how to have a say in decisions that are made about you e.g. voting; getting access to files; how to act in court, etc.

Very Important	Important	Not Important	Quite Unimportant

Give a reason for this rating: _____

_____

Skill 3 - how to accept people who do not speak English.

Very Important	Important	Not Important	Quite Unimportant

Give a reason for this rating: _____

_____

Skill 4 - non-violent ways of settling disagreement with others.

Very Important	Important	Not Important	Quite Unimportant

Give a reason for this rating: _____

_____

13b. Did Malmsbury teach you any of the above skills? (Place a tick in the box if the skill was taught and then say how it was taught.)

Skill	How it was taught
1	
2	
3	
4	

13c. List other skills that should be taught at Malmsbury?

Skill	Why?	How?

14. Do you have any other comments or suggestions for <u>improvements</u> to Malmsbury training programs?

15a. Have you been charged with any offences since leaving Malmsbury? Yes/No

b. If so, what?